arXiv:1111.2977v1 [math.FA] 13 Nov 2011

On Maximal Measures

Silviu Teleman

July 9, 2009

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to present some properties of Choquet maximal Radon probability measures on compact convex subsets of Hausdorff localy convex topological real vector squares. Theorem 3.12 is the main result of the paper. While somewhat technical, the results here are foundational for my proof of a Stone-Weierstraß theorem for non-separable C^*-algebras, in the companion paper 'On the Stone-Weierstraß theorem'.

1 Measure-theoretic properties of the Choquet topology

Section 1

Let E be any Hausdorff locally convex topological real vector space and let $K \subset E$ be any (non-empty) compact convex subset.

Let *ex* K be the set of the extreme points of K. On *ex* K various topologies have been considered: the *facial topology* (see [1], Ch. II, Section 6; [10], Ch. II, Section 4; [14]), the *Choquet topology* C (see [9]; [10], Ch. II, Section 2) and the *maximal topology* M (see [24], p. 20), of which the first is the weakest and the third is the strongest; weaker, however, than the topology σ induced on *ex* K by the topology of K.

In [4], C.J.K. Balty considered a "parametrization" of the topologies on *ex* K, for which the topologies C, M and σ become particular cases, corresponding to special choices of the "parameter." Specifically, let $\mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ be the set of all Radon probability measures on K. For any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, we denote by $b(\mu)$ its *barycenter*; it is determined by the equation

$$h(b(\mu)) = \int_K h(x)d\mu(x), \quad \forall h \in A(K),$$

where $A(K)$ denotes the set of all continuous affine real functions on K. For any subset $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, Balty defines a subset $F \subset K$ to be $\mathcal{M}$-*extremal* if it is universally measurable and if

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}, b(\mu) \in F \Longrightarrow \mu(F) = 1.$$

Consider now the set

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}}(K) = \{F \subset K; F \text{ compact and } \mathcal{M}\text{-extremal}\}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\mathcal{M}}(exK) = \{F \cap (exK); F \in \mathcal{F}_M(K)\}$$

Then $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\mathcal{M}}(ex\ K)$ is the set of all closed sets for a topology on *ex* K, which is called by Balty the $\mathcal{M}$-topology (see [4], p. 502). If $\mathcal{M}$ consists of all Dirac measures, then the $\mathcal{M}$-topology is the relative topology σ on *ex* K, induced by the topology of K; it is too fine for our purposes.

If $\mathcal{M}$ consists of all discrete measures (i.e., $\mathcal{M} = M_d(K)$, the set of all discrete measures), then a compact subset $F \subset K$ is $\mathcal{M}_d(K)$-extremal if, and only if, it is *extremal*, i.e.,

$$x_1, x_2 \in K, tx_1 + (1-t)x_2 \in F \text{ for a } t \in (0,1) \Longrightarrow x_1, x_2 \in F.$$

(As immediately seen, the definition of an extremal subset $F \subset K$ does not require any measurability property of F.)

If $F \subset K$ is compact, however, then F is extremal if, and only if,

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}^1_+(K), b(\mu) \in F \Longrightarrow \mu(F) = 1$$

(see [10]). It follows that a compact set $F \subset K$ is extremal if, and only if, it is $\mathcal{M}^1_+(K)$-extremal, or *absorbent*, in the terminology of [10]. The $\mathcal{M}^1_+(K)$-topology on *ex* K coincides, therefore, with the $M_d(K)$-topology; it was introduced in [9] and called there the *Choquet topology.* It has many remarkable properties and it will play a fundamental role in the sequel.

We shall denote

$$\mathcal{F}_C(K) = \{F \subset K; F \text{ compact and extremal}\}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_C(ex\ K) = \{F \cap (ex\ K); F \in \mathcal{F}_C(K)\}\,.$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_c(ex\ K)$ is the set of all C-closed subsets of *ex* K.

1.1 Remark. It is easy to see that any union and any intersection of extremal subsets of K are extremal subsets of K. A face of K is any convex extremal subset; hence, any union of faces of K is an extremal subset. Conversely, as remarked by C.J.K. Balty (see [3], p. 298), any extremal subset of K is a union of faces, which are easily shown to be the maximal convex subsets. It follows that any compact extremal subset of K is a union of compact faces (see [24], p. 2).

Since for any compact extremal subset $F \subset K$ we have that

$$\overline{co}(F) \cap (ex\ K) = ex\ \overline{co}(F) = ex\ F = F \cap (ex\ K),$$

one can immediately infer that $(ex\ K, C)$ is a quasi-compact space. Since any subset of *ex* K is extremal, it follows that $(ex\ K; C)$ satisfies the (T_1) separation axiom; i.e., any finite subset of *ex* K is C-closed.

The Choquet topology on *ex* K coincides with the original topology, induced by that of K, if, and only if, *ex* K is a closed subset of K (see [10], Corollary 2.5, p. 62).

Section 2

For any topological space $(T;\tau)$ we shall denote by $\mathcal{B}(T;\tau)$ the σ-algebra of all *Borel measurable* subsets of $(T;\tau)$; i.e., $\mathcal{B}(T;\tau)$ is the smallest σ-algebra of subsets of T, containing all open (equivalently, all closed) subsets (in τ).

By $\mathcal{B}_0(T;\tau)$ we shall denote the σ-algebra of all *Baire measurable* subsets of $(T;\tau)$; i.e., $\mathcal{B}_0(T;\tau)$ is the smallest σ-algebra of subsets of T, containing all *closed* G_j-subsets of T (with respect to the topology τ). Of course, we have $\mathcal{B}_0(T;\tau) \subset \mathcal{B}(T;\tau)$, and the equality holds if $(T;\tau)$ is metrizable.

We shall denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)$ the σ-algebra of subsets of $ex\ K$, given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K) = \{B \cap (ex\ K); B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)\}\,;$$

by $\mathcal{B}_1(K;C)$ we shall denote the σ-algebra of subsets of K, generated by

$$\mathcal{B}_0(K) \cup \mathcal{F}_C(K),$$

and by $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;C)$ we shall denote the σ-algebra of subsets of $ex\ K$, given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;C) = \{B \cap (ex\ K); B \in \mathcal{B}_1(K;C)\}\,.$$

Of course, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;C)$ is the σ-algebra of subsets of $ex\ K$, generated by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K) \cup \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_C(ex\ K).$$

We obviously have the inclusion

$$\mathcal{B}_0(ex\ K;C) \subset \mathcal{B}(ex\ K;C) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;C).$$

Section 3

We shall denote by $S(K)$ the sup-cone of all continuous convex real functions defined on K. The *Choquet order relation* $<$ on $\mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mu < \nu \Leftrightarrow \mu(f) \leq \nu(f), \quad \forall f \in S(K),$$

for any μ, $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ (see [11], [17], Ch. XI, [19], Ch. 4).

The latticial Stone-Weierstrass Approximation Theorem implies that $<$ is, indeed, an order relation, whereas a simple compactness argument shows that $(\mathcal{M}_+^1(K), <)$ is inductive. The application of the Zorn Lemma implies that for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ there exists a ($<$)-maximal $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, such that $\mu < \nu$. We shall also say that such a $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ is a *Choquet maximal* measure in $\mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$.

It is easy to see that $\mu < \nu \Rightarrow \mu\,\tilde{}\,\nu$ (i.e., $b(\mu) = b(\nu)$). In particular, for any $x \in K$, there exists a ($<$)-maximal measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, such that $\varepsilon_x < \mu$, where ε_x is the Dirac measure at x.

The following extension (relativization) of the Choquet-Bishop-de Leeuw Theorem was first proved in ([22], Theorem 1.3).

1.2 Theorem. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ be any ($<$)-maximial measure and $K_1 \subset K$ any compact subset, such that* supp $\mu \subset K_1$. *Then $\mu(B) = 0$ for any $B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$, such that $B \cap (ex\ K_{1)} = \emptyset$.*

It immediately follows that if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ is any ($<$)-maximal measure, then by the formula

$$\tilde{\mu}_0(B \cap (exK)) = \mu(B), B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K),$$

one correctly defines a probability measure $\tilde{\mu}_0$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)$. This is what we shall temporarily call the *boundary measure* associated to μ (see [1], p. 35, for another definition).

We can consider the smallest compact extremal subset $K_1 \subset K$, such that supp $\mu \subset K_1$. Then we have the following (see [22], Proposition 1.7):

1.3 Theorem. *The set* $K_1 \cap (ex\ K)$ *is the smallest* C*-closed subset of ex* K*, whose* $\tilde{\mu}_0$*-outer measure is equal to 1.*

We shall see below that $K_1 \cap (ex\ K)$ is, indeed, the *support* of the measure $\tilde{\mu}_0$(which is still to be extended!). The followng was first proved in ([22], Theorem 1.5).

1.4 Theorem. *If* $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ *is Choquet maximal, then*

$$\mathcal{B}_0(exK; C) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(exK)(\tilde{\mu}_0).$$

(For any measure λ on the σ-algebra $\sum$ of subsets of a set S, we shall denote by $\sum(\lambda)$ the Lebesque completion of $\sum$ with respect to λ, and we shall keep the same notation for the canonical extension of λ to $\sum(\lambda)$).

Boundary measures associated to Choquet maximal Radon probability measures on K enjoy regularity properties, which we shall present below.

Section 4

The following is an extension of ([23], Theorem 1). We shall first recall that for any bounded function $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$ the *upper-semicontinuous concave hull* $\hat{f} : K \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\hat{f}(x) = \inf \{h(x); h \in A(K), f \leq h\};$$

and that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ is Choquet maximal if, and only if, $\mu(f) = \mu(\hat{f})$, for any $f \in S(K)$; equivalently, for any continuous function $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$; equivalently, again, for any upper semicontinuous function $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$ (see [23], Corollary to Proposition 2).

1.5 Theorem. *Let* $(f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be any sequence of Baire measurable functions* $f_n : K \to \mathbb{R}$*,* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*; and let* $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ *be any Choquet maximal measure. Then there exists a metrizable compact convex set* $K_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$*, an affine continuous surjection* $\theta : K \to K_0$*, and a sequence* $(g_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *if Baire measurable functions* $g_n : K_0 \to \mathbb{R}$*,* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*, such that*

1) $f_n = g_n \circ \theta$*,* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*; and*

2) $\theta_*(\mu)$ *is a Choquet maximal measure on* K_0*.*

Proof. a) First, it is obvious that there exists a sequence $(h_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of functions $h_n \in A(K)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that all the functions f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be measurable with respect to the smallest σ-algebra $\sum$ of subsets of K, with respect to which all the functions h_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are measurable.

b) Since μ is Choquet maximal, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exits a sequence $(h_{n,m})_{m\in N}$, $h_{n,m} \in A(K)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $h_n^2 \leq h_{n,m}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\mu(h_n^2) = \inf \{\mu(h_{n,0} \wedge ... \wedge h_{n,m}); m \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{h_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\mathcal{F}_0' = \{h_{n,m}; n, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_0'$; for any $h \in \mathcal{F}_1$ we can find a sequence $(h_n')_{n\in N}$, $h_n' \in A(K)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $h^2 \leq h_n'$, $u \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$(*) \quad \mu(h^2) = \inf \left\{\mu(h_0' \wedge ... \wedge h_m'); m \in \mathbb{N}\right\};$$

let then $\mathcal{F}' = \{h_m'; h \in \mathcal{F}_1, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and define $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_1'$. By proceeding inductively, we can find an increasing sequence $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n\in m}$ of countable subsets of $A(K)$, such that for any $h \in \mathcal{F}_n$ there exists a sequence $(h'_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$, $h'_m \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $h^2 \le h'_m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and (*) should hold.

Let then $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \bigcup\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_n$. Then $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ is a countable subset of $A(K)$, such that for any $h \in \mathcal{F}_\infty$ there exists a sequence $(h'_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $h'_n \in \mathcal{F}_\infty$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $h^2 \le h'_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and (*) should hold again.

Of course, any f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is $\mathcal{F}_\infty$-measurable.

c) Let us now define the affine continuous mapping

$$\theta : K \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{F}_\infty}$$

given by

$$\theta(x) = (h(x))_{h\in\mathcal{F}_\infty}, \ n \in K.$$

Then $\theta(K) = K_0$ is a metrizable compact convex set, which meets the requirements of the Theorem: the existence of the Baire measurable functions $g_n : K_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ is ensured by the $\mathcal{F}_\infty$-measurability of the functions f_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, whereas the fact that $\theta_*(\mu)$ is Choquet maximal on K_0 follows from the fact that

$$\mu(h^2) = \theta_*(\mu)(p_h^2) \le \theta_*(\mu)((p_h^2)\hat{}\ ) \le \mu((h^2)\hat{}\ ), h \in \mathcal{F}_\infty,$$

and, therefore,

$$\theta_*(\mu)(p_h^2) = \theta_*(\mu)((p_h^2)\hat{}\ ), h \in \mathcal{F}_\infty,$$

and from ([22], Corollary 1 to Proposition 1.3) there $p_h : K_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ denotes the restriction to K_0 of the canonical projection of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{F}_\infty}$, corresponding to $h \in \mathcal{F}_\infty$. □

The following was proved in ([23], Corollary to Theorem 1).

1.6 Corollary. *Let μ be a maximal Radon probability measure on the compact convex set K, and let $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\mathcal{D}_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0(K) \cap \mathcal{F}_C(K)$, such that $D_0 \subset D$ and*

$$\mu(D) - \varepsilon < \mu(D_0).$$

Proof. Let K_0 be a metrizable compact convex set and let $\theta : K \to K_0$ be a continuous affine surjection, corresponding to the function $f_0 = x_D$, as in the preceding Theorem. Then $\theta(D)$ is Baire measurable in $\theta(K) = K_0$ and, since $\theta_*(\mu)$ is maximal on K_0, by the Theorem of Choquet for the metrizable case ($ex\ K$ is a G_j-subset of K_0, which supports $\theta_*(\mu)$), we have that

$$\mu(D) = \mu(\theta^{-1}(\theta(D))) = \theta_*(\mu)(\theta(D)) = \theta_*(\mu)(\theta(D) \cap (ex\ K_0)).$$

By Ulam's Theorem, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a compact subset $C \subset \theta(D) \cap (ex\ K)$, such that

$$\theta_*(\mu)(\theta(D) \cap (ex\ K)) - \varepsilon < \theta_*(\mu)(C).$$

Then the set $D_0 = \theta^{-1}(C)$ has the requested property. □

The following theorem was proved by S. Teleman for the case of the pure states space $P(A)$ of an arbitrary C^*-algebra, and for maximal orthogonal measures, with a rather complicated proof (see [23], Theorem 6). It was extended to arbitrary compact convex sets K, and any Choquet maximal measures on K, by C.J.K. Balty, with the help of a very simple and elegant proof (see [3], p. 302).

1.7 Theorem. *For any Choquet maximal Radon probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, the formula*

$$\tilde{\mu}_1(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}) = \sup\left\{\mu(F); F \in \mathcal{F}(K), F \cap (ex\ K) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{B}}\right\}, \tilde{B} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K; C),$$

extends $\tilde{\mu}_0$ to a probability measure $\tilde{\mu}_1 : \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K; C) \to [0,1]$, which is regular in the sense that

a) $\tilde{\mu}_1(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}) = \sup\left\{\tilde{\mu}_1(\tilde{F}); \tilde{F} \subset \tilde{B}, \tilde{F} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(ex\ K); C)\right\} \tilde{\mathcal{B}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K; C)$; and we have $\tilde{\mu}_1(\tilde{F}) = \tilde{\mu}_0^*(\tilde{F})$, for any $\tilde{F} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(ex\ K; C)$; i.e.,

b) $\tilde{\mu}_1(\tilde{F}) = \inf\left\{\tilde{\mu}_0(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}); \tilde{F} \subset \tilde{B}, \tilde{B} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)\right\}, \tilde{F} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(ex\ K; C)$.

We refer to the paper of Balty (see [3], p. 302) for a proof of this theorem.

We immediately obtain the following Theorem, which extends Theorem 6 from [23].

1.8 Theorem. *a) $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K; C) \subset \mathcal{B}(ex\ K; C)(\tilde{\mu}_1)$;*

b) $\tilde{\mu}_1$ is τ-continuous; i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mu}_1(\bigcap_{\alpha} \tilde{F}_\alpha) = \inf\left\{\tilde{\mu}_1(\tilde{F}_\alpha); \alpha \in I\right\},$$

for any decreasing set $(\tilde{F}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$ of C-closed subsets $\tilde{F}_\alpha \subset ex\ K$, $\alpha \in I$.

From now on, we shall denote by $\tilde{\mu}$ the restriction $\tilde{\mu}_1 \mid \mathcal{B}(ex\ K; C)$ and we shall call it the boundary measure determined by "μ".

The following corollary strengthens Theorem 2.

1.9 Corollary. *The set $K_1 \cap (ex\ K)$ is the smallest C-closed subset of $ex\ K$, whose $\tilde{\mu}$-measure is equal to 1.*

Proof. The existence of a smallest C-closed subset $\tilde{F}_1 \subset ex\ K$, such that $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F}_1) = 1$, immediately follows from Theorem 6, b). By Theorem 5, b), we have that $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F}_1) = \tilde{\mu}_0^*(\tilde{F}_1) = 1$. By Theorem 2, we have that $\tilde{F}_1 = K_1 \cap (ex\ K)$. □

Section 5

The regularity of the measure $\tilde{\mu}$ immediately implies the following extension of the Lusin Theorem.

1.10 Theorem. *Let $f : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$ be any $\tilde{\mu}$-measurable function. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a C-closed subset $\tilde{F} \subset ex\ K$, such that $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F}) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and $f \mid \tilde{F}$ is C-continuous.*

Proof. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a C-closed subset $\tilde{F}_0 \subset ex\ K$, such that $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F}_0) > 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and $f \mid \tilde{F}_0$ be bounded; therefore, there exist m, $M \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $m \leq f(x) \leq M$, $x \in \tilde{F}_0$. Let $\varepsilon_i > 0$, $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, be chosen, such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_i = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. If

$$E_{n,k} = f^{-1}((-\infty, m + k\frac{M-m}{n})) \cap \tilde{F}_0, n \in \mathbb{N}^*, k \in \mathbb{N},$$

by the regularity of $\tilde{\mu}$ we can find C-closed subsets $\tilde{F}_{n,k} \subset ex\ K$, such that $\tilde{F}_{n,0} \subset E_{n,0}$ and

$$\tilde{F}_{n,k} \subset E_{n,k} \backslash E_{n,k-1}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n;$$

and such that for $\tilde{M}_n = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n} \tilde{F}_{u,k}$ we have $\tilde{\mu}(M_n) > 1 - \varepsilon_n$. If $f_n : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$f_n = \sum_{k=0} (m + k\frac{M-m}{n}) x_{\tilde{F}_k},$$

then f_n is continuous on $\tilde{M}_n$ and

$$\left\| (f_n - f) x_{\tilde{M}_n} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

It follows that the set $\tilde{F} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{M}_n$ meets the requirements of the statement of the Theorem. □

1.11 Remark. The proof given above is the standard one for the Lusin Theorem, usuallly given for the case of (Hausdorff) compact spaces. The new feature appearing here is the fact that the Tietze-Kryson Theorem does not hold any more and, therefore, $f \mid \tilde{F}$ cannot be always extended to a C-continuous function on $ex\ K$. This problem will be discussed again below (see Theorem 10).

An important property, which is sometimes shared by (probability) measures, is that of being *perfect.*

We recall that a probability space $(M, \sum, \lambda)$ is said to be *perfect* if for any λ-measurable function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ and any $f_*(\lambda)$-measurable subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}$, there exists a Borel measurable subset $B \subset S$, such that

$$f_*(\lambda)(S \backslash B) = 0.$$

(Here $f_*(\lambda)$ is the *full* direct image of λ through f, defined on the σ-algebra

$$f_*(\sum(\lambda)) = \left\{ S \subset \mathbb{R}; f^{-1}(S) \in \sum(\lambda) \right\}$$

by

$$f_*(\lambda)(S) = \lambda(f^{-1}(S)), \qquad S \in f_*(\sum(\lambda))$$

(see [14], p. 17; [15], Ch. V, Section 22; [20]).

We have the following:

1.12 Theorem. *Any boundary measure $\tilde{\mu}$ is perfect.*

Proof. Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ be such that $f^{-1}(S) \in \mathcal{B}(ex\ K; C)(\tilde{\mu})$. For a given $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find a C-closed subset $\tilde{F} \subset ex\ K$, such that $\tilde{F} \subset f^{-1}(S)$ and $\tilde{\mu}(f^{-1}(S) \backslash \tilde{F}) < \varepsilon$; and, moreover, such that $f \mid \tilde{F}$ be C-continuous. Then $f(\tilde{F}) \subset S$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$, such that

$$f_*(\tilde{\mu})(S \backslash f(\tilde{F})) < \varepsilon.$$

The theorem now immediately follows. □

The preceding theory extends the theory of Radon (probability) measures on compact spaces T, which can be obtained as a particular case by taking for K the state space $S(C(T))$ of the commutative C^*-algebra $C(T)$, of all continuous complex functions on T. In this case $P(C(T)) = ex\ S(C(T))$ canonically identifies with T, whereas the Choquet topology on $P(C(T))$ corresponds to the topology of T by this identification.

Section 6

As far as C-continuous functions are concerned, we have the following theorem, which implies that, in some cases, the set of the C-continuous real functions is very small in size.

1.13 Theorem. *Any C-continuous function $g : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$ can be uniquely extended to a continuous function $\hat{g} : \overline{ex\ K} \to \mathbb{R}$; the function $\tilde{g}$ is constant on any sequence contained in $\overline{ex\ K}$. Moreover, g can be uniquely extended as a continuous function $\tilde{\tilde{g}}$ on the smallest compact extremal subset $K_0 \subset K$, such that $K_0 \supset ex\ K$, and such that $\tilde{\tilde{g}}$ be constant on any face contained in K_0. Conversely, for any continuous function $k : K_0 \to \mathbb{R}$, such that k is constant on any face contained in K_0, the function $k \mid ex\ K$ is C-continuous.*

Proof. a) For any $r \in \mathbb{R}$ let us define

$$\tilde{E}(g;r) = \{x \in ex\ K;\ g(x) \leq r\}$$

and

$$\tilde{F}(g;r) = \{x \in ex\ K;\ g(x) \geq r\}.$$

Then $\tilde{E}(g;r)$ and $\tilde{F}(g;r)$ are C-closed subsets of $ex\ K$, and

1) $\tilde{E}(g;r_1) \subset \tilde{E}(g;r_2)$, for $r_1 \leq r_2$, $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$;
2) $\tilde{F}(g;r_1) \supset \tilde{F}(g;r_2)$, for $r_1 \leq r_2$, $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$;
3) $\tilde{E}(g;r) = \emptyset$, for $r < m$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$;
4) $\tilde{E}(g;r) = ex\ K$, for $r \geq \mathbf{M}$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$;
5) $\tilde{F}(g;r) = ex\ K$, for $r \leq m$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$;
6) $\tilde{F}(g;r) = \emptyset$, for $r > M$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$; (here $m = \inf\{g(x); x \in ex\ K\}$ and $M = \sup b\,\{g(x); x \in ex\ K\}$).

By the definition of the Choquet topology on $ex\ K$, we infer that there exist, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, a *smallest* compact extremal subset $E(g;r) \subset K$ and a *smallest* compact extremal subset $F(g;r) \subset K$, such that

$$E(g;r) \cap (ex\ K) = \tilde{E}(g;r),\ r \in \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$F(g;r) \cap (ex\ K) = \tilde{F}(g;r),\ \ r \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Of course, we have that

1′) $E(g;r_1) \subset E(g;r_2)$, for $r_1 \leq r_2$, r_1, $r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$;
2′) $F(g : r_1) \supset F(g;r_2)$, for $r_1 \leq r_2$, r_1, $r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$;
3′) $E(g;r) = \emptyset$, for $r < m$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$;
4′) $E(g;r) = K_0$, for $r \geq M$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$;
5′) $F(g;r) = K_0$, for $r \leq m$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$;
6′) $F(g;r) = \emptyset$, for $r > M$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

It follows that we can consider the Riemann-Stieltjes integrals

$$(1) \qquad \varphi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} r d x_{E(g;r)}(x), \quad x \in K,$$

and

$$(2) \qquad \varphi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} r d(1 - x_{F(g;r)}(x)); \quad x \in K.$$

Of course, we have

$$(3) \quad \varphi(x) = \psi(x) = g(x), \qquad x \in ex\ K.$$

By integrating by parts in (1) and (2), we find

$$(1\prime) \qquad \psi(x) = M - \int_m^M x_{E(g;r)}(x)dr, \qquad x \in K_0,$$

and

$$(2\prime) \qquad \varphi(x) = m + \int_m^M x_{F(g;r)}(x)dr, \qquad x \in K_0.$$

It follows that if we define

$$\Psi(x) = M - \int_m^M x_{E(g;r)}(x)dr, \qquad x \in K,$$

and

$$\Phi(x) = m + \int_m^M x_{F(g;r)}(x)dr, \quad x \in K,$$

then Φ is a convex upper semicontinuous function on K, Ψ is a concave lower semicontinuous function on K, and

$$g(x) = \Phi(x) = \Psi(x), \ \ x \in ex\ K.$$

We infer that $\Phi(x) \leq \Psi(x)$, $\forall x \in K$, and

$$K_1 = \{x \in K; \Phi(x) = \Psi(x)\}$$

is a compact extremal subset of K (just apply the weak form of H. Bauer's Minimum Principle (see [6], Lemma 1; [16], Ch. XI, Theorem T.12)), such that $K_1 \supset ex\ K$ and, therefore, $K_1 \supset K_0$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that if g is not constant, then $K_1 = K_0$.

b) Let us now define

$$\tilde{\tilde{g}}(x) = \Phi(x)(= \Psi(x)), \quad x \in K_0;$$

then $\tilde{\tilde{g}}$ obviously is a continuous function on K_0, which extends g, and it is affine on any face contained in K_0.

c) Now we immediately infer that $\tilde{g} = \tilde{\tilde{g}} \mid \overline{ex\,K}$ is continuous on $\overline{ex\,K}$, and, therefore, it is the unique continuous extension of g to $\overline{ex\,K}$.

Since g^2 is also C-continuous on $ex\ K$, and since $(\tilde{g})^2$ obviously is the continuous extension of g^2 to $\overline{ex\ K}$, it follows that $\tilde{g}$, as well as $(\tilde{g})^2$, are affine on any segment contained in $\overline{ex\ K}$; hence, $\tilde{g}$ is constant on any such segment.

d) Let us now prove that $\tilde{\tilde{g}}$ is constant on any face contained in K_0. It will be sufficient to prove that $\tilde{\tilde{g}}$ is constant on any segment contained in K_0. Let then $[x_1, x_2] \subset K_0$ be such a segment and assume that $x_1 \neq x_2$. Let $x_0 = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$ and denote $a_0 = \tilde{\tilde{g}}(x_0)$. From

$$a_0 = M - \int_m^M x_{E(g;a)}(x_0)da$$

we infer that $x_0 \notin E(g;a)$, for $a \subset a_0$; and $x_0 \in E(g;a)$, for $a > a_0$. Similarly, from

$$a_0 = m + \int_m^M x_{F(g;a)}(x_0)da$$

we infer that $x_0 \in F(g;a)$, for $a < a_0$; and $x_0 \notin F(g;a)$, for $a > a_0$. Since the sets $E(g;a)$ and $F(g;a)$ are extremal, we infer that

$$(4) \qquad [x_1, x_2] \subset E(g;a), \qquad \forall a > a_0,$$

and

$$(5) \qquad [x_1, x_2] \subset F(g;a), \qquad \forall a < a_0.$$

From (4) we infer that $\tilde{\tilde{g}}(x) \leq a_0$, $\forall x \in [x_1, x_2]$, whereas from (5) we infer that $\tilde{\tilde{g}}(x) \geq a_0$, $\forall x \in [x_1, x_2]$; hence $\tilde{\tilde{g}}(x) = a_0$, $x \in [x_1, x_2]$.

The uniqueness of a continuous extension of g to K_0, which is constant on any face of K_0 is obvious.

e) Let now $k : K_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function, such that $k \mid K_\alpha = k_\alpha$ (= const.), $\forall \alpha \in I$, where $K_\alpha \subset K_0$, $\alpha \in I$, are the (maximal) faces of K_0. Then, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, the sets

$$E(k;a) = \{x \in K_0; k(x) \leq a\},$$

and

$$F(k;a) = \{x \in K_0; k(x) \geq a\},$$

are compact (since k is continuous) and extremal, being unions of faces. It immediately follows that $k \mid ex\ K$ is C-continuous. □

1.14 Remark. If $K_0 = K$, which is implied by $\overline{ex\ K} = K$, then the constants are the only C-continuous functions on $ex\ K$.

For instance, if $A \subset \mathcal{L}(H)$, $1 \in A$, is an irreducible C^*-algebra of operators, not containing non-zero compact operators, then for $K = S(A)$ we have $ex\ K = P(A)$, and $\overline{P(A)} = S(A)$ (see [13], Section 11, Lemma 11.2.1).

The preceding result shows that Theorem 7 cannot be given the form one usually gives to the Lusin Theorem in the case of Hausdorff compact spaces; namely, it is not true that for any $\tilde{\mu}$-measurable function f, $ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a C-closed subset $\tilde{F} \subset ex\ K$, and a C-continuous function $g : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F}) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and $g \mid \tilde{F} = f \mid \tilde{F}$. Nevertheless, the following theorem shows that such a result is true, provided we also use the original topology.

First, we prove the following:

1.15 Lemma. *Let $F \subset K$ be a compact extremal subset. Then the topology induced on $F \cap (ex\ K)$ by the Choquet topology on $ex\,K$ coincides with the Choquet topology on $ex(\overline{co}(F)) = F \cap (ex\ K)$, corresponding to the compact convex set $\overline{co}(F)$, which contains F as a compact extremal set.*

Proof. If $F_0 \subset \overline{co}(F)$ is any compact extremal subset (in $\overline{co}(F)$), then

$$F_0 \cap ex\ \overline{co}(F) = (F_0 \cap F) \cap (ex\ K),$$

and $F_0 \cap F \subset K$ is a compact extremal subset of K; indeed, if $x_0 \in F_0 \cap F$ and $x_0 = tx_1 + (1-t)x_2$, $0 < t < 1$, $x_1, x_2 \in K$, then $x_1, x_2 \in F \subset \overline{co}(F)$ and, therefore $x_1, x_2 \in F_0$, since F_0 is extremal in $\overline{co}(F)$.

Conversely, if $F_0 \subset K$ is a compact extremal subset of K, then $F_0 \cap F \subset \overline{co}(F)$ is a compact extremal subset of $\overline{co}(F)$. □

1.16 Theorem. *For any $\tilde\mu$-measurable function $f : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$, and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a C-closed subset $\tilde F \subset ex\ K$, and a continuous function $g : K \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $\tilde\mu(\tilde F) > 1 - \varepsilon$, $f \mid \tilde F$ is C-continuous and $f \mid \tilde F = g \mid \tilde F$.*

Proof. By Theorem 7, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a C-closed subset $\tilde F \subset ex\ K$, such that $\tilde\mu(\tilde F) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and $f \mid \tilde F$ is C-continuous. Then, by the preceding Lemma, $f \mid ex\ \overline{co}(F)$ is C-continuous on $ex\ \overline{co}(F)$, for any compact extremal subset $F \subset K$, such that $F \cap (ex\ K) = \tilde F$. By Theorem 9, $f \mid (ex\ \overline{co}(F)$ extends to a continuous function $g : K \to \mathbb{R}$, if we also take into account the Tietze-Kryson Theorem. □

Section 7

It is known that, in general, a probability measure $\nu_0 : \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K) \to [0,1]$ does not always induce a Choquet maximal measure $\hat\nu_0$ on K, by the formula

$$\hat\nu_0(B) = \nu_0(B \cap (ex\ K)), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K).$$

Equivalently, a Baire probability measure on K, which is pseudoconcentrated on $ex\ K$, is not necessarily Choquet maximal (see [19], Ch. 9).

For a probability measure $\nu_1 : \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K) \to [0,1]$ we shall denote by $\hat\nu_1$ the measure on $\mathcal{B}_0(K)$ given by $\hat\nu_1(B) = \nu_1(B \cap (ex\ K))$, $B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$.

The measures $\hat\nu_0$ and $\tilde\nu_1$, defined as above, have unique extensions as Radon measures on K, for which we shall keep the same notation.

With the exceptin of the "only if" part in a), which is due to S. Teleman (see [23], Corollary to Theorem 1), the following theorem is due to C.J.K. Balty. We present it here with a different proof (see [3], p. 303).

1.17 Theorem. *a) The measure $\hat\nu_0$ is Choquet maximal if, and only if,*

$$\nu_0(\tilde B) = \sup\left\{\nu_0(\tilde F); \tilde F \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(ex\ K) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(ex\ K), \tilde F \subset \tilde B\right\}, \quad \tilde B \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K);$$

b) If ν_1 is regular, then $\hat\nu_1$ is Choquet maximal and $(\hat\nu_1)^{\tilde{}} = \nu_1$.

Proof. a) Since $\hat\nu_0$ is defined at the beginning as a Baire measure on K only, we shall denote also by $\hat\nu_0$ the corresponding (unique) Radon extension. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ be a Choquet maximal measure on K, such that $\hat\nu < \mu$, and let $\tilde\mu : \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K) \to [0,1]$ be the corresponding boundary measure. We shall first prove that

$$\nu_0(\tilde B) \leq \tilde\mu(\tilde B), \quad \forall \tilde B \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K),$$

provided the regularity property in a) holds, whence it will immediately follow that

$$\nu_0(\tilde B) = \tilde\mu(\tilde B), qquad \forall \tilde B \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K),$$

and, therefore, $\tilde\nu_0(B) = \mu(B)$, $\forall B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$. This will imply that $\hat\nu_0 = \mu$; i.e., $\hat\nu_0$ is Choquet maximal on K.

Indeed, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an $\tilde F_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(ex\ K) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)$, such that

$$\nu_0(\tilde B) < \nu_0(\tilde F_0) + \varepsilon, \ \ \tilde F_0 \subset \tilde B;$$

also, there exists an $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}(K)$, such that

$$\tilde F_0 = F_0 \cap (ex\ K).$$

Since F_0 is compact, there exists a compact $B_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$, such that $F_0 \subset B_0$ and $\hat{\nu}_0(F_0) = \hat{\nu}_0(B_0)$. We infer that

$$\nu_0(\tilde{B}) - \varepsilon < \nu_0(\tilde{F_0}) \leq \nu_0(B_0 \cap (ex\ K)) = \hat{\nu}_0(B_0) = \hat{\nu}_0(F_0) \leq \mu(F_0) = \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F_0}) \leq \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{B}),$$

where the third inequality is a consequence of ([17], Ch. XI, Theorem T.7).

The necessity of the condition was proved in ([3], Corollary to Theorem 1).

b) Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ be a Choquet maximal measure on K, such that $\hat{\nu}_1 < \mu$, and let $\tilde{\mu} : \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K) \to [0, 1]$ be the corresponding boundary measure. Similarly, as above, we shall prove that $\nu_1(\tilde{B}) \leq \tilde{\mu}(B)$, $\forall \tilde{B} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K)$, whence we shall get that $\nu_1(\tilde{B}) = \tilde{\mu}(B)$, $\forall \tilde{B} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K)$, and, therefore, $\hat{\nu}_1(B) = \mu(B)$, $\forall B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$. This will imply that $\hat{\nu}_1 = \mu$; i.e., $\hat{\nu}_1$ is a Choquet maximal Radon probability measure on K, and $(\hat{\nu}_1)^{\tilde{}} = \nu_1$.

Indeed, given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\tilde{B} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K)$, we can find an $F \in \mathcal{F}(K)$, such that

$$\tilde{F} = F \cap (ex\ K) \subset \tilde{B} \text{ and } \nu_1(\tilde{B}) - \varepsilon < \nu_1(\tilde{F}).$$

Since F is compact, there exists a compact $B_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$, such that $F \subset B_0$ and $\hat{\nu}_1(F) = \hat{\nu}_1(B_0)$. We then have

$$\nu_1(\tilde{B}) - \varepsilon < \nu_1(\tilde{F}) \leq \nu_1(B_0 \cap (ex\ K)) = \hat{\nu}_1(B_0) = \hat{\nu}_1(F) \leq \mu(F) = \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F}) \leq \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{B}),$$

where the third inequality is a consequence of ([17], Ch. XI, Theorem T.7). $\square$

1.18 Remark. The measure $\hat{\nu}_1$ is determined by $\nu_1 \mid \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)$. Theorem 5 shows that if $\hat{\nu}_1$ is Choquet maximal and if the equality $\nu_1 = (\hat{\nu}_1)^{\tilde{}}$ holds, then ν_1 is regular.

2 Measure-theoretic properties of the maximal topology

The maximal topology, and its basic properties, including its measure-theoretic ones, were introduced in [24]. C.J.K. Balty (see [4]) extended the main results to the more general situation in which the maximal topology is replaced by a topology depending on a "parameter." It is obvious that the Choquet topology is weaker than the maximal topology. As shown by Balty, the Choquet topology is, in general, strictly weaker than the maximal topology; moreover, there may exist maximally continuous real valued functions which are not continuous for the Choquet topology, and, in general, the σ-algebra of the Borel measurable subsets of *ex* K, for the Choquet topology, is strictly included in the σ-algebra of the Borel measurable subsets of *ex* K, for the maximal topology. We shall discuss in detail the corresponding examples of Balty.

We shall also prove in detail the fact that the boundary measures, corresponding to Choquet maximal measures, extend as regular Borel measures with respect to the maximal topology. The result was obtained in [24], by adopting the method of proof developed by Balty for the case of the Choquet topology.

The *maximal topology* on *ex* K, which we shall denote by M, is a (T_1)-quasicompact topology, stronger than the Choquet topology and weaker than the original topology of *ex* K. The facts that both $(ex\ K; C)$ and $(ex\ K; M)$ are quasicompact and

$C \subset M$ are compatible with $C \neq M$, since C is a Hausdorff topology if, and only if, $ex\ K$ is closed in K (see [?], Corollary 2.5, p. 62), and this does not always hold.

The maximal topology will be introduced by methods similar to those used for the Choquet topology, but all essential constructions will be carried out on $\overline{ex\ K}$, with the help of Choquet maximal measures.

Section 1

A compact subset $F \subset K$ will be said to be *maximally extremal* if the following holds

(*) if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ is Choquet maximal and if $b(\mu) \in F$, then $\mu(F) = 1$.

2.1 Remark. Compact maximally extremal subsets of K are called dilated in ([2], p. 113).

It is easy to prove that we have the following properties.

i) If $F \subset K$ is a compact extremal, $F_0(\overline{F \cap (ex\ K)}$ is also maximally extremal and $F \cap (ex\ K) = F_0 \cap (ex\ K)$.

Indeed, if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ is Choquet maximal, then $b(\mu) \in F_0 \Longrightarrow b(\mu) \in F \Longrightarrow \mu(F) = 1 \Longrightarrow \mu(\overline{co}(F)) = 1$. Since $\mu \mid \overline{co}(F)$ is in $M_+^1(\overline{co}(F))$ and since it is Choquet maximal on $\overline{co}(F)$, we infer that

$$\mu(F_0) = \mu(\overline{F \cap (ex\ K)}) = \mu(\overline{ex\ \overline{co}(F)}) = 1$$

(see [22], Proposition 1.10). The equality $F \cap (ex\ K) = F_0 \cap (ex\ K)$ is obvious.

ii) If $F_1, F_2, ..., F_n$ are maximally extremal compact subsets of K, then $\bigcup\limits_{i=1}^{n} F_i$ is a maximally extremal compact subset of K.

iii) For any family $(F_i)_{i \in I}$ of maximally extremal compact subsets $F_i \subset K$, $i \in I$, the set $\bigcap\limits_{i \in I} F_i$ is a maximally extremal compact subset of K.

From ii) and iii) we immediately infer that the set $\mathcal{M}(K)$ of all maximally extremal compact subsets of K is the set of all closed subsets of K in a suitable topology of K. The *maximal topology* on $ex\ K$ will be the topology induced by it on $ex\ K$; i.e., the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(ex\ K) = \{F \cap (ex\ K); F \in \mathcal{M}(K)\}$$

is the set of all closed subsets of $ex\ K$ for the maximal topology, which we shall denote by M. Of course, M is weaker than the original topology of $ex\ K$ and, by i), it is stronger than the Choquet topology C.

2.2 Lemma. *a) For any maximally extremal compact subset $F \in \mathcal{M}(K)$, we have*

$$ex\ \overline{co}(F) = F \cap (ex\ K).$$

b) For any maximally extremal subset $F \in \mathcal{M}(K)$, the set $F_0 = F \cap (ex\ K)$ is also maximally extremal and

$$F_0 \cap (ex\ K) = F \cap (ex\ K).$$

Proof. a) We obviously have that $F \cap (ex\ K) \subset ex\ \overline{co}(F)$ and, by the Milman Converse Theorem, we have $ex\ \overline{co}(F) \subset F$. Let now $x_0 \in ex\ \overline{co}(F)$; we shall show that $x_0 \in ex\ K$. Indeed, let $x_1, x_2 \in K$ be such that

$$x_0 = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2).$$

Let $\mu_i \in \mathcal{M}^1_+(K)$ be a Choquet maximal measure, such that $b(\mu_i) = x_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and define $\mu_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_1 + \mu_2)$. Then μ_0 is Choquet maximal (see [12]) and $b(\mu_0) = x_0 \in F$. It follows that $\mu_0(F) = 1$ and, therefore,

$$\mu_1(F) = \mu_2(F) = 1.$$

We infer that $b(\mu_i) = x_i \in \overline{co}(F)$, $i = 1, 2$, and, therefore,

$$x_1 = x_0 = x_2.$$

b) Let now $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}^1_+(K)$ be Choquet maximal, such that $b(\mu_0) \in F_0$. Then $b(\mu_0) \in F$ and, therefore, $\mu_0(F) = 1$. It follows that $\mu_0(\overline{co}(F)) = 1$ and $\mu_0 \mid \overline{co}(F) \in \mathcal{M}^1_+(\overline{co}(F))$ is Choquet maximal. We infer that

$$\operatorname{supp}\ \mu_0 = \operatorname{supp}(\mu_0 \mid \overline{co}(F)) \subset \overline{ex\ \overline{co}(F)} = F_0$$

by the first part of the Lemma and, by ([22], Proposition 1.10). The equality

$$F_0 \cap (ex\ K) = F \cap (ex\ K)$$

is now obvious. □

2.3 Proposition. *The topological space* $(ex\ K; M)$ *is* (T_1)*-quasicompact.*

Proof. Let $(\tilde{F}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$ be a centered family of M-closed subsets of $ex\ K$. Then $(\overset{\approx}{F}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$ is a centered family of maximally extremal compact subsets of K and, therefore, $F = \bigcap_\alpha \overset{\approx}{F}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ is a maximally extremal compact subset of K. It follows that $\overline{co}(F) \neq \emptyset$ and, therefore,

$$\emptyset \neq ex\ \overline{co}(F) = F \cap (ex\ K) \subset F_\alpha, \ \forall \alpha \in I.$$

It follows that $(ex\ K; M)$ is quasicompact. It is obvious that for any $x \in ex\ K$, the set $\{x\}$ is M-closed in $ex\ K$, by a theorem of H. Bauer. □

Section 2

A universally integrable function $\varphi : K \to \mathbb{R}$ will be said to be *maximally convex* (resp. *maximally concave*) on K if

$$\varphi(b(\mu)) \leq \int_K \varphi d\mu,$$

$$\text{(resp., } \varphi(b(\mu)) \geq \int_K \varphi d\mu),$$

for any Choquet maximal measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^1_+(K)$. Of course, φ is maximally convex if, and only if, $-\varphi$ is maximally concave; if φ is maximally convex (resp., maximally concave) and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then $\lambda\varphi$ is maximally convex (resp., maximally concave); if φ_i, $i = 1, 2, ..., n$, are maximally convex (resp., maximally concave) functions on K, then $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \varphi_i$ is maximally convex (resp., maximally concave) on K any suitably bounded point-wise converging sequence of maximally convex (resp., maximally concave) functions on K has a maximally convex (resp., maximally concave) limit function.

It is easy to infer now that for any compact subset $F \subset K$ we have F maximally extremal $\Leftrightarrow x_F$ maximally convex.

Section 3

Let now $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ be any Choquet maximal measure and let $M_1 \subset K$ be the smallest maximally extremal compact subset, such that supp $\mu \subset M_1$.

2.4 Theorem. *a) The set $M_1 \cap (ex\ K)$ is the smallest M-closed subset of $ex\ K$, whose $\tilde{\mu}_0$-outer measure is equal to* 1.

b) For any $M \in \mathcal{M}(K)$ we have

$$\tilde{\mu}_0^*(M \cap (ex\ K)) = \mu(M).$$

Proof. a) Let $B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$ be such that

$$B \cap (exK) \supset M_1 \cap (exK).$$

From $M_1 \subset \text{supp}\mu$ we infer that $\mu \mid \overline{co}(M_1)$ is Choquet maximal as a Radon probability measure on $\overline{co}(M_1)$. Since

$$B_0 = (\complement B) \cap \overline{co}(M_1) \in \mathcal{B}_0(\overline{co}(M_1)),$$

from

$$B_0 \cap (ex\ \overline{co}(M_1)) = B_0 \cap M_1 \cap (ex\ K) = \emptyset$$

and from Theorem 1 we infer that $\mu(B_0) = 0$. It follows that $\mu(\complement B) = 0$, and, therefore,

$$\tilde{\mu}_0(B \cap (ex\ K)) = \mu_0(B) = 1.$$

We infer that $\tilde{\mu}_0^*(M_1 \cap (ex\ K) = 1$.

b) Let now $M \in \mathcal{M}(K)$. Then there exists a compact Baire measurable set $B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$, such that

$$M \subset B \text{ and } \mu(B) = \mu(M).$$

It follows that $M \cap (ex\ K) \subset B \cap (ex\ K)$ and

$$(1) \quad \tilde{\mu}_0^*(M \cap (ex\ K)) \leq \tilde{\mu}_0(B \cap (ex\ K)) = \mu(B) = \mu(M).$$

If $\mu(M) = 0$, the required equality is proved. If $\mu(M) > 0$, let us define

$$\nu = \mu(M)^{-1} x_M \mu.$$

Then $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ and ν is Choquet maximal. From $\nu(M) = 1$ we infer that

$$\text{supp}\ \nu \subset M,$$

and, therefore, from part a) of the Proof, we have

$$(2) \qquad \tilde{\nu}_0^*(M \cap (ex\ K)) = 1.$$

Let now $B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$ be such that $B \cap (ex\ K) \supset M \cap (ex\ K)$. From (2) we infer that

$$\tilde{\nu}_0(B \cap (ex\ K)) = 1,$$

and, therefore, $\nu(B) = 1$. By the definition of ν, it follows that

$$\mu(M) = \mu(B \cap M) \leq \mu(B);$$

i.e.,

$$\mu(M) \leq \tilde{\mu}_0(B \cap (ex\ K)),$$

and this implies that

$$(3) \qquad \mu(M) \leq \tilde{\mu}_0^*(M \cap (exK)).$$

From (1) and (3) the required equality immediately follows.

c) Let now $M_0 \in \mathcal{M}(K)$ be such that

$$\tilde{\mu}_0^*(M_0 \cap (ex\ K)) = 1.$$

Then, from b), we infer that $\mu(M_0) = 1$ and, therefore, $M_1 \subset M_0$; hence,

$$M_1 \cap (ex\ K) \subset M_0 \cap (ex\ K),$$

and the Theorem is proved.

2.5 Theorem. *If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ is Choquet maximal, then $\mathcal{B}_0(ex\ K; M) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)(\tilde{\mu}_0)$.*

Proof. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}(K)$ be such that

$$(ex\ K)\backslash M = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} (M_n \cap (ex\ K)),$$

where $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of sets $M_n \in \mathcal{M}(K)$, $n \geq 0$, which can be assumed to be increasing. From $M \cap M_n \cap (ex\ K) = \emptyset$ and from Lemma 2, a), we infer that $M \cap M_n = \emptyset$, $n \geq 0$. It follows that

$$\mu(M) + \mu(M_n) \leq 1, \ \ \forall n \geq 0,$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu}_0^*((ex\ K) \cap \backslash M) = \sup\{\tilde{\mu}_0^*(M_n \cap (ex\ K)); n \geq 0\} \quad &= \sup\{\mu(M_n); n \geq 0\} \leq 1 - \mu(M) \\ &= 1 - \tilde{\mu}_0^*(M \cap (ex\ K))\end{aligned}$$

(see also [18], Ch. I, Section 1.5, Proposition I.5.2; [22], Proposition 1.12). It follows that $M \cap (ex\ K)$ is $\tilde{\mu}_0$-measurable, and, therefore, we have the inclusion

$$\mathcal{B}_0(ex\ K; M) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)(\tilde{\mu}_0).$$

The Theorem is proved. □

Section 4

Let now $\mathcal{B}_1(K;M)$ be the σ-algebra of subsets of K, generated by $\mathcal{M}(K)\cup\mathcal{B}_0(K)$, and let $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;M)$ be the σ-algebra of subsets of $ex\ K$, generated by $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(ex\ K)\cup\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)$, where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(ex\ K)=\{M\cap(ex\ K);M\in\mathcal{M}(K)\}$$

is the set of all M-closed subsets of $ex\ K$. Of course, we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;M)=\{M\cap(ex\ K);M\in\mathcal{B}_1(K;M)\},$$

and also the following inclusions

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)\subset\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\,K;M),$$

$$\mathcal{B}_0(ex\ K;M)\subset\mathcal{B}(ex\ K;M)\subset\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;M),$$
$$\mathcal{B}_0(ex\ K;C)\subset\mathcal{B}_0(ex\ K;M),$$
$$\mathcal{B}(ex\ K;C)\subset\mathcal{B}(ex\ K;M),$$
$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\,K;C)\subset\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\,K;M).$$

Theorem 5 can now be extended to the case of the σ-algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\,K;M)$, essentially with the same proof. It was obtained in [24], and extended to a more general situation, by Balty, in [4]. Due to its special relevance to the present work, we shall present it with a complete proof.

2.6 Theorem. *For any maximal measure $\mu\in\mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, the formula*

$$\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{M})=\sup\left\{\mu(M);M\in\mathcal{M}(K),M\cap(ex\ K)\subset\tilde{M}\right\},\tilde{M}\in\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;M),$$

extends $\tilde{\mu}_0$ to a probability measure

$$\tilde{\mu}:\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;M)\to[0,1],$$

which is regular in the sense that

$$a)\quad\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{M})=\sup\left\{\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F});\tilde{F}\subset\tilde{M},\tilde{F}\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(ex\ K)\right\},\tilde{M}\in\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;M);$$

and we have $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F})=\tilde{\mu}_0^*(\tilde{F})$, for any $\tilde{F}\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(ex\ K)$; i.e.

$$b)\quad\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F})=\inf\left\{\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{B});\tilde{F}\subset\tilde{B},\tilde{B}\in\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)\right\},\tilde{F}\in\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(ex\,K).$$

Proof. Adopting the proof of C.J.K. Balty (see [3], p. 302), given for the case of the Choquet topology, we shall define, for any $B\subset K$,

$$\mu'(B)=\sup\{\mu(F);F\in\mathcal{M}(K),F\subset B\},$$

$$\mu''(B)=\sup\{\mu(F);F\in\mathcal{M}(K),F\cap(ex\ K)\subset B\cap(ex\ K)\}.$$

We obtain the following properties
a) $\mu'(B)\le\mu''(B)$, for any $B\subset K$;
b) $\mu'(F)=\mu(F)$, for any $F\in\mathcal{M}(K)$;

c) $\mu'(B) = \mu(B)$, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$; indeed, this is an immediate consequence of ([23], Theorem 1, Corollary ?) by taking into account the fact that any compact extremal subset of K is maximally extremal.

d) $\mu'(G) = \mu(G)$, for any G_j-subset G of K; indeed, this is an immediate consequence of ([23], Theorem 2).

e) $\mu'(B) \leq \mu(B)$, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}(K)$;

f) $\mu''(B) \leq \mu(B)$, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$; indeed, by Theorem 12, b), for any $F \in \mathcal{M}(K)$ and any $B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$, such that

$$F \cap (ex\ K) \subset B \cap (ex\ K),$$

we have

$$\mu(F) = \tilde{\mu}_0^*(F \cap (ex\ K)) \leq \tilde{\mu}_0(B \cap (ex\ K)) = \mu(B).$$

g) We have

$$\mu'(B_1) + \mu'(B_2) \leq \mu'(B_1 \cup B_2),$$

for any $B_1, B_2 \subset K$, such that $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$, and

$$\mu''(B_1) + \mu''(B_2) \leq \mu''(B_1 \cup B_2),$$

for any $B_1, B_2 \subset K$, such that $B_1 \cap B_2 \cap (ex\ K) = \emptyset$.

Indeed, the first inequality is obvious by the definition of μ', whereas the second follows from Lemma 2, a) and the Krein-Milman Theorem.

h) Let $\mathcal{A}' = \left\{B \in \mathcal{B}(K); \mu'(B) = \mu(B), \mu'(\complement B) = \mu(\complement B)\right\}$. Then $\mathcal{A}'$ is a σ-algebra, such that $\mathcal{M}(K) \subset \mathcal{A}'$, by b) and d); and $\mathcal{B}_0(K) \subset \mathcal{A}'$, by c). It follows that $\mathcal{M}_1(K) \subset \mathcal{A}'$, by the definition of $\mathcal{M}_1(K)$.

i) $\mu''(M) = \mu(M)$, for any $M \in \mathcal{M}_1(K)$.

Indeed, by a) and h) we have

$$\mu(M) \leq \mu''(M),$$

for any $M \in \mathcal{M}_1(K)$. By g), we have

$$1 = \mu(M) + \mu(\complement M) \leq \mu''(M) + \mu''(\complement M) \leq 1;$$

hence, $\mu''(M) = \mu(M)$, for any $M \in \mathcal{M}_1(K)$.

j) $M \in \mathcal{M}_1(K)$ and $M \cap (ex\ K) = \emptyset \Rightarrow \mu(M) = 0$.

Indeed, this is an immediate consequence of i). It follows that by the formula

$$(*) \quad \tilde{\mu}(M \cap (ex\ K)) = \mu(M), \quad M \in \mathcal{M}_1(K),$$

we correctly define a probablity measure on $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_1(ex\ K)$, and we have

$$\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{M}) = \sup\left\{\mu(M); M \in \mathcal{M}(K), M \cap (ex\ K) \subset \tilde{M}\right\},$$

for any $\tilde{M} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_1(ex\ K)$.

Equality a) in the statement of the Theorem is now an immediate consequence, whereas equality b) follows from Theorem 11, b) and from i) and equality (*). The Theorem is proved.

2.7 Theorem. *a)* $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_1(ex\ K) \subset \mathcal{B}(ex\ K; M)(\tilde{\mu})$*;*

b) $\tilde{\mu}$ *is* τ*-continuous, i.e.*

$$\tilde{\mu}(\bigcap_{\alpha} \tilde{F}_\alpha) = \inf\left\{\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F}_\alpha); \alpha \in I\right\},$$

for any decreasing set $(\tilde{F}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$ *of* M*-closed subsets* $\tilde{F}_\alpha \subset ex\ K$*,* $\alpha \in I$*.*

Proof. a) Since $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(ex\ K)$ is the set of all M-closed subsets of $ex\ K$, we infer that we have

$$\mathcal{B}(ex\ K; M) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_1(ex\ K).$$

For any $\tilde{M} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_1(ex\ K)$, by Theorem 13, a), there exists a F_α-subset $\tilde{F} \subset ex\ K$, and a G_j-subset $\tilde{G} \subset ex\ K$ (with respect to the maximal topology of $ex\ K$), such that

$$\tilde{F} \subset \tilde{M} \subset \tilde{G},$$

and

$$\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F}) = \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{M}) = \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{G}).$$

It follows that $\tilde{M} \in \mathcal{B}(ex\ K; M)(\tilde{\mu})$.

b) $(\tilde{\tilde{F}}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$ is a decreasing set of maximally extremal compact subsets of K, such that $\tilde{\tilde{F}}_\alpha \cap (ex\ K) = \tilde{F}_\alpha$, $\alpha \in I$.

We then have

$$\mu(\bigcap_\alpha \tilde{\tilde{F}}_\alpha) = \inf \left\{ \mu(\tilde{\tilde{F}}_\alpha); \alpha \in I \right\} = \inf \left\{ \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{\tilde{F}}_\alpha); \alpha \in I \right\} \geq \tilde{\mu}(\bigcap_\alpha \tilde{F}_\alpha) = \tilde{\mu}(\bigcap_\alpha \tilde{\tilde{F}}_\alpha),$$

because $\bigcap\limits_\alpha \tilde{\tilde{F}}_\alpha$ is a maximally extremal compact subset of K, such that

$$\left(\bigcap_\alpha \tilde{\tilde{F}}_\alpha \right) \cap (ex\ K) = \bigcap_\alpha \tilde{F}_\alpha.$$

The Theorem is proved. □

Let now $M_1 \subset K$ be the smallest maximally extremal compact subset of K, such that $M_1 \supset \operatorname{supp} \mu$.

2.8 Corollary. *The set $\tilde{M}_1 = M_1 \cap (ex\ K)$ is the smallest M-closed subset of ex K, such that $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{M}_1) = 1$; i.e., $\tilde{M}_1$ is the M-closed support of $\tilde{\mu}$.*

Proof. By the definition of $\tilde{\mu}$, given by formula (*) in the proof of Theorem 13, we have

$$\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{M}_1) = \tilde{\mu}(M_1 \cap (ex\ K)) = \mu(M_1) = 1.$$

If $\tilde{M}_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}(ex\ K)$ is such that $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{M}_0) = 1$, then $\tilde{\tilde{M}}_0 \in \mathcal{M}(K)$ and

$$1 = \tilde{\mu}(M_0) = \mu(\tilde{\tilde{M}}_0);$$

hence, $\tilde{\tilde{M}}_0 \supset \operatorname{supp} \mu$ and, therefore, $\tilde{\tilde{M}}_0 \supset M_1$. It follows that $\tilde{M}_0 = \tilde{\tilde{M}}_0 \cap (ex\ K) \supset M_1 \cap (ex\ K) = \tilde{M}_1$. □

Section 5

The analogue of Theorem 7 holds, with a similar proof, which we shall omit.

2.9 Theorem. *Let $f : ex\ K \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any $\tilde{\mu}$-measurable function. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an M-closed subset $\tilde{M} \subset ex\ K$, such that*

$$\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{M}) > 1 - \varepsilon \quad \textit{and } f \mid \tilde{M} \textit{ is } M\textit{-continuous.}$$

We also have the following:

2.10 Theorem. *For any maximal measure* $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ *the measure* $\tilde{\mu} : \mathcal{B} : (ex\ K; M)(\tilde{\mu}) \to [0,1]$ *is perfect.*

Its proof is similar to that of Theorem 8.

Section 6

We shall now consider the M-continuous functions $f : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$, for which we shall get a complete characterization.

The following lemma shows that the maximal topology on *ex* K is hereditary.

2.11 Lemma. *Let* $M \in \mathcal{M}(K)$ *be any maximally extremal compact subset of* K*. Then the topology induced on* $\tilde{M} = M \cap (ex\ K)$ *by the maximal topology of ex* K *coincides with the maximal topology on ex* $\overline{co}(M) = M \cap (ex\ K)$*.*

Proof. a) Let $M_0 \subset \overline{co}(M)$ be any maximally extremal compact subset of $\overline{co}(M)$. Then $M_0 \cap M$ is a maximally extremal compact subset of K, such that

$$M_0 \cap M \cap (ex\ K) = M_0 \cap ex\ \overline{co}(M).$$

This shows that any M-closed subset of *ex* $\overline{co}(M)$ is an M-closed subset of *ex* K; i.e., it is closed in the induced topology.

Indeed, let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ be any maximal measure, such that $b(\mu_0) \in M_0 \cap M$; then $\mu(M) = 1$, since M is maximally extremal and, therefore, $\mu(\overline{co}(M)) = 1$. We immediately infer that the restriction μ_1 of μ to $\overline{co}(M)$ is maximal and, since $b(\mu_1) = b(\mu) \in M_0$, we have $\mu_1(M_0) = 1$, because M_0 is maximally extremal, as a subset of $\overline{co}(M)$. We then infer that $\mu(M_0 \cap M) = 1$.

b) Conversely, let $M_1 \subset K$ be any maximally extremal compact subset of K. Then the set $M_1 \cap M$ is a maximally extremal compact subset of $\overline{co}(M)$, such that

$$M_1 \cap ex\ \overline{co}(M) = (M_1 \cap M) \cap ex\ \overline{co}(M),$$

and this shows that any closed subset of *ex* $\overline{co}(M)$ for the induced topology is an M-closed subset of *ex* $\overline{co}(M)$.

Indeed, let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\overline{co}(M))$ be a maximal measure, such that $b(\mu) \in M_1 \cap M$. Let μ_1 be the canonical extension of μ to K. We shall show that $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ is Choquet maximal on K.

Let $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ be a maximal measure, such that $\mu_1 < \mu_2$. Then we have $b(\mu) = b(\mu_1) = b(\mu_2) \in M_1 \cap M$. This implies that $\mu_2(M_1) = \mu_2(M) = 1$, since M_1 and M are maximally extremal compact subsets of K. It follows that $\mu_2(\overline{co}(M)) = 1$ and, therefore, the restriction $\mu_3 = \mu_2 \mid \overline{co}(M)$ is Choquet maximal, as a measure on $\overline{co}(M)$. Let us show that $\mu < \mu_2 \mid \overline{co}(M)$, on $\overline{co}(M)$. To this end, let $\varphi \in S(\overline{co}(M))$ be given. Since the set of the restrictions to $\overline{co}(M)$ of the continuous affine real functions on E is uniformly dense in $\mathcal{A}(\overline{co}(M))$ (see [19], Ch. 9, Proposition 4.5), we infer that, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a finite set $\{h_1, h_2, ..., h_n\} \subset \mathbf{A}(K)$, such that

$$\varphi(x) - \varepsilon < \max\{h_i(x); 1 \le i \le n\} \le \varphi(x), x \in \overline{co}(M).$$

Let $\varphi_0 \in S(K)$ be defined by

$$\varphi_0(x) = \max\{h_i(x); 1 \le i \le n\}, x \in K.$$

We then have

$$\mu(\varphi) - \varepsilon\mu(\varphi_0) = \mu_1(\varphi_0) \le \mu_2(\varphi_0) = \mu_3(\varphi_0) \le \mu_3(\varphi),$$

and, therefore, $\mu(\varphi) \leq \mu_3(\varphi)$, $\varphi \in S(\overline{co}(M))$. We infer that $\mu < \mu_3$ on $\overline{co}(M)$ and, since μ is maximal, it follows that $\mu = \mu_3$. It follows that $\mu_1 = \mu_2$; i.e., μ_1 is Choquet maximal on K.

Since $b(\mu_1) = b(\mu) \in M_1 \cap M$, we infer that

$$\mu(M_1 \cap M) = \mu_1(M_1 \cap M) = 1.$$

The Lemma is proved.

2.12 Lemma. *Let $\varphi : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be a maximally concave lower semicontinuous function. Then φ attains its minimum on ex K. If $\varphi(x) = 0$, $\forall x \in ex\ K$, then $\varphi \geq 0$ and $\varphi(x) = 0$, for any $x \in \overline{ex\ K}$.*

Proof. Let $m = \inf\{\varphi(x); x \in K\}$ and $K_0 = \{x \in K; \varphi(x) = m\}$. Then K_0 is a non-empty compact subset of K. We shall prove that K_0 is maximally extremal. Indeed, let $x_0 \in K_0$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ be Choquet maximal, such that $b(\mu) = x_0$. Then we have

$$m \leq \mu(\varphi) \leq \varphi(b(\mu)) = m,$$

and, therefore, $\mu(\varphi) = m$. It follows that $\mu(K_0) = 1$. Lemma 2 now shows that

$$K_0 \cap (exK) \neq \emptyset.$$

If $\varphi(x) = 0$, $\forall x \in ex\ K$, we infer that $m = 0$. Since the set K_0 is compact (and maximally extremal), we have $K_0 \supset \overline{ex\ K}$. The Lemma is proved. □

2.13 Theorem. *Any M-continuous function $g : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$ has a unique continuous extension $\hat{g} : \overline{ex\ K} \to \mathbb{R}$. The mapping $g \mapsto \hat{g}$ has the following property $f \circ \hat{g} = (f \circ g)\hat{}$ and*

$$(*)\quad f(\hat{g}(b(\mu))) = \int_{\overline{ex\ K}} (f \circ \hat{g}) d\mu = \int_{ex\ K} (f \circ g) d\tilde{\mu},$$

for any continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and any Choquet maximal measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, such that $b(\mu) \in \overline{ex\ K}$. Conversely, for any continuous function $h : \overline{ex\ K} \to \mathbb{R}$, such that the equality

$$(f \circ h)(b(\mu)) = \int_{\overline{ex\ K}} (f \circ h) d\mu,$$

holds for any continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and any Choquet maximal measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, such that $b(\mu) \in \overline{ex\ K}$, the restriction $h \mid (ex\ K)$ is M-continuous, and $(h \mid (ex\ K))\hat{} = h$.

Proof. Since g is M-continuous and $(ex\ K; M)$ is quasi-compact, g is bounded. Let us define

$$m = \inf\{g(x); x \in ex\ K\},\ M = \sup\{g(x); x \in ex\ K\}.$$

For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\tilde{E}(g; a) = \{x \in ex\ K; g(x) \leq a\},$$

$$\tilde{F}(g; a) = \{x \in ex\ K; g(x) \geq a\};$$

then $\tilde{E}(g;a)$ and $\tilde{F}(g;a)$ are M-closed subsets of $ex\ K$, and, therefore, $E(g;a) = \overline{\tilde{E}(g;a)}$, $F(g;a) = \overline{\tilde{F}(g;a)}$ are maximally extremal compact subsets of K (see Lemma 2, b)).

The following properties are obvious

i) $E(g;a_1) \subset E(g;a_2)$, for $a_1 \leq a_2$, $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$;
ii) $F(g;a_1) \supset F(g;a_2)$, for $a_1 \leq a_2$, $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$;
iii) $E(g;a) = \emptyset$, for $a \subset m$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$;
iv) $E(g;a) = \overline{ex\ K}$, for $a \geq M$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$;
v) $F(g;a) = \overline{ex\ K}$, for $a \leq m$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$;
vi) $F(g;a) = \emptyset$, for $a > M$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

As in the proof of Theorem 9, we shall consider the Riemann-Stieltjes integrals

$$(1) \quad \psi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} a d x_{E(g;a)}(x), \ \ x \in K,$$

and

$$(2) \quad \varphi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} a d(1 - x_{F(g;a)}(x)), \quad x \in K.$$

We obviously have that

$$(3) \quad \varphi(x) = \psi(x) = g(x), \ \ x \in ex\ K.$$

Integration by parts in (1) and (2) gives

$$(1') \quad \psi(x) = M - \int_m^M x_{E(g;a)}(x) da, \quad x \in \overline{ex\ K},$$

and

$$(2') \ \ \varphi(x) = m + \int_m^M x_{F(g;a)}(x) da, \ x \in \overline{ex\ K}.$$

If we define

$$\Psi(x) = M - \int_m^M x_{E(g;a)}(x) da, \ x \in K,$$

and

$$\Phi(x) = m + \int_m^M x_{F(g;a)}(x) da, \quad x \in K,$$

then Φ is a maximally convex upper semicontinuous function on K, whereas Ψ is a maximally concave lower semicontinuous function on K; we obviously have

$$g(x) = \Phi(x) = \Psi(x), \ \ x \in ex\ K.$$

From Lemma 4 we now infer that $\Phi \leq \Psi$ on K, and $K_1 = \{x \in K; \Phi(x) = \Psi(x)\}$ is a maximally extremal compact subset of K, such that $K_1 \supset \overline{ex\ K}$.

Let us now define $\hat{g} : \overline{ex\ K} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\hat{g}(x) = \Phi(x) (= \Psi(x)), \quad x \in \overline{ex\ K}.$$

It is easy to see that $\hat{g}$ is continuous on $\overline{ex\ K}$ and, therefore, it is the unique continuous extension of g to $\overline{ex\ K}$.

Let now $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$ be a maximal measure, such that $b(\mu) \in \overline{ex\ K}$. We have

$$\operatorname{supp}\, \mu \subset \overline{ex\ K}$$

and, therefore,

$$\hat{g}(b(\mu)) = \Phi(b(\mu)) \leq \int_{\overline{ex\ K}} \Phi d\mu = \int_{\overline{ex\ K}} \Psi d\mu \leq \Psi(b(\mu)) = \hat{g}(b(\mu)),$$

whence we get that

$$\hat{g}(b(\mu)) = \int_{\overline{ex\ K}} \hat{g} d\mu.$$

Let now $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous; then $f \circ g$ is M-continuous on $ex\ K$. If $x_0 \in \overline{ex\ K}$, and $x_\alpha \in ex\ K$, $\alpha \in A$, is a set such that $x_0 = \lim_{\alpha \in A} x_\alpha$, then $g(x_\alpha) \to \hat{g}(x_0)$ and

$$(f \circ g)(x_\alpha) \to (f \circ g)\hat{}\,(x_0).$$

It follows that

$$(f \circ g)\hat{}\,(x_0) = f(\hat{g}(x_0)) = (f \circ \hat{g})(x_0),$$

for any $x_0 \in \overline{ex\ K}$. We infer that

$$f(\hat{g}(b(\mu))) = f(\int_{\overline{ex\ K}} \hat{g} d\mu) = \int_{\overline{ex\ K}} (f \circ \hat{g}) d\mu,$$

for any maximal measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, such that $b(\mu) \in \overline{ex\ K}$.

The equality

$$\int_{\overline{ex\ K}} h d\mu = \int_{ex\ K} h d\tilde{\mu}$$

holds for any continuous function $h : \overline{ex\ K} \to \mathbb{R}$ and any maximal measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, by virture of the definition of $\tilde{\mu}$ and of the inclusion $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_1(ex\ K) \supset \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(ex\ K)$.

Let us now assume that $h : \overline{ex\ K} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, such that

$$(4) \quad (f \circ h)(b(\mu)) = \int_{\overline{ex\ K}} (f \circ h) d\mu,$$

for any continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, and any maximal measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, such that $b(\mu) \in \overline{ex\ K}$. From (4) we immediately infer that

$$x_{(-\infty,a]}(h(b(\mu))) = \int_{\overline{ex\ K}} (x_{(-\infty,a]} \circ h) d\mu,$$

and

$$x_{[a,+\infty)}(h(b(\mu))) = \int_{\overline{ex\ K}} (x_{[a,-\infty)} \circ h) d\mu,$$

for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and any maximal measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(K)$, such that $b(\mu) \in \overline{ex\ K}$.

It immediately follows that the compact sets

$$E(h; a) = \left\{x \in \overline{ex\ K}; h(x) \leq a\right\}, \quad a \in \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$F(h; a) = \left\{x \in \overline{ex\ K}; h(x) \geq a\right\}, \quad a \in \mathbb{R},$$

are maximally extremal and, therefore, $h \mid (ex\ K)$ is M-continuous. The equality $(h \mid (ex\ K)) = h$ is now obvious. The Theorem is proved.

Let $C(ex\ K; M)$ be the C^*-algebra of all M-continuous complex functions on $ex\ K$.

2.14 Corollary. *For any maximal measure* $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^1_+(K)$*, such that* $b(\mu) \in \overline{ex\ K}$*, the mapping*

$$C(ex\ K; M) \ni g \mapsto \int_{ex\ K} g d\mu$$

*is a *-homomorphism onto* C*.*

Proof. Make $f(x) = x^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, in Theorem 18. □

2.15 Remark. 1) Since any C-continuous function $g : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$ is M-continuous, equality (*) holds for any C-continuous g.

2) From property (*) one easily infers that for any M-continuous function $g : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$, the corresponding function $\hat{g} : \overline{ex\ K} \to \mathbb{R}$ is constant on any polygonal line contained in $\overline{ex\ K}$; therefore, if $\overline{ex\ K} = K$, then the constants are the only M-continuous real functions on $ex\ K$.

2.16 Theorem. *For any* $\tilde{\mu}$*-measurable function* $g : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}$*, and any* $\varepsilon > 0$*, there exists an* M*-closed set* $\tilde{F} \subset ex\ K$ *and a continuous function* $g : K \to \mathbb{R}$*, such that* $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F}) > 1 - \varepsilon$*,* $f \mid \tilde{F} = g \mid \tilde{F}$ *and* $f \mid \tilde{F}$ *is* M*-continuous.*

Proof. Similar to that of Theorem 10, with the use of Lemma 3 and Theorem 18. □

Section 7

The relationships between the topologies C, M and the original topology on $ex\ K$, denoted σ, are also illustrated by the following theorem.

2.17 Theorem. *The following statements are equivalent:*

a) $C = \sigma$*; b)* $M = \sigma$*; c)* C *is Hausdorff; d)* M *is Hausdorff; e)* $ex\ K$ *is closed in* K*.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the implication d) ⇒ e). Let then $x_0 \in ex\ K$. By the Corollary to Theorem 18, the mapping

$$C((exK; M); \mathbb{C}) \ni g \mapsto \hat{g}(x_0)$$

is a complex *-homomorphism; hence, there exists an $\tilde{x}_0 \in ex\ K$, such that

$$(1) \quad \hat{g}(x_0) = g(\tilde{x}_0), \quad g \in C((ex\ K; M); \mathbb{C}).$$

On the other hand, for any maximal measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^1_+(K)$, such that $b(\mu) = x_0$, we will have

$$(2) \quad \hat{g}(x_0) = \int_{ex\ K} g(x) d\tilde{\mu}(x), \ g \in C((exK; M); \mathbb{C}).$$

From (1) and (2) we infer that $\tilde{\mu} = \varepsilon_{\tilde{x}_0}$; it follows that $\mu = \varepsilon_{\tilde{x}_0}$; i.e., $x_0 = \tilde{x}_0 \in ex\ K$. □

2.18 Remark. The equivalence c) ⇔ e) is proved in ([10], Corollary 2.5, p. 62).

Section 8

As shown by Balty (see [4], Example 2.2, p. 503), in general, there are M-continuous real functions, which are not C-continuous; it follows that, in general, the maximal topology is strictly finer than the Choquet topology. Moreover, in general, the σ-algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{B}_1}(ex\ K; C)$ is strictly included in the σ-algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{B}_1}(ex\ K; M)$. Due to the relevance of Balty's examples to the present work, we shall present them here in somewhat greater detail.

1) Let x be any compact Hausdorff space and let $x_{0,}x_1, x_2 \in X$ be three distinct points; let μ be a Radon probability measure on X, such that supp $\mu = x$ and

$$\mu(\{x_0\}) = \mu(\{x_1\}) = \mu(\{x_2\}) = 0.$$

Let A be the Banach subspace of $C(X \times [0, \frac{1}{2}]; \mathbb{R})$, consisting of all functions $f \in C(X \times [0, \frac{1}{2}]; \mathbb{R})$, such that

$$(1) \quad f(x_0, 0) = tf(x_1, t) + (1-t)f(x_2, t),\ 0 \le t \le \frac{1}{2},$$

and

$$(2) \quad f(x_1, 0) + f(x_0, 0) = 4 \int_{x \times [0, \frac{1}{2}]} f(x, t) d\mu(x) dt.$$

Let K be the *state space* of A; i.e.,

$$K = \{L \in A^*; \|L\| = L(1) = 1\},$$

endowed with the $\sigma(A^*; A)$ topology. (See also [2], Chapter 1, Section 4).

One defines the "evaluation mapping"

$$\varepsilon : X \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right] \to K$$

by

$$\varepsilon(x, t)(f) = f(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in X \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right].$$

Then we have the following properties:

a) $\varepsilon\left(X \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]\right) \supset ex\ K$;

b) $\varepsilon(x_0, 0) = \varepsilon(x_2, 0)$;

c) $ex\ K = \varepsilon\left(X \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]\right) \setminus \{\varepsilon(x_0, 0)\}$;

d) $\varepsilon \mid \left(X \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]\right) \setminus \{(x_0, 0), (x_2, 0)\}$ is a homeomorphism of $\left(X \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]\right) \setminus \{(x_0, 0), (x_2, 0)\}$ onto $ex\ K$.

The maximal Radon probability measures ν on K, representing $\varepsilon(x_0, 0)$, are supported by $\varepsilon\left(\{x_1, x_2\} \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]\right)$ and are given by

$$\nu(f) = \int_{\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]} (tf(x_1, t) + (1-t)f(x_2, t)) d\nu_0(t),$$

for any $f \in C(X \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]; \mathbb{R})$, such that, $f(x_0, 0) = f(x_2, 0)$ where ν_0 is any Borel probability measure on $\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$.

If $F \subset K$ is any compact extremal subset, such that $\varepsilon(x_0, 0) \in F$, then from (1) we get that

$$(3) \quad \lambda\varepsilon(x_1, t) + (1-\lambda)\varepsilon(x_2, t) \in F,$$

for any $t \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$ and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$. Since F is compact, from (3) we infer that

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\varepsilon\right)\left(x_1,0\right)+\varepsilon(x_2,0)) \in F,$$

and, therefore, from (2) it follows that

$$\varepsilon\left(X \times \left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right]\right) = \varepsilon\left((\operatorname{supp}\mu) \times \left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right]\right) \subset F.$$

It follows that the C-closed subsets of *ex* K are *ex* K itself, and the subsets of *ex* K, which are compact in the original topology.

On the other hand, any compact subset $F \subset \varepsilon\left(X \times \left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right]\right)$, containing $\varepsilon\left(\{x_1,x_2\} \times \left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right]\right)$, if $\varepsilon(x_0,0) \in F$ is M-extremal; it follows that any subset of *ex* K, which is closed in the original topology and contains the set

$$\tilde{M_0} = \varepsilon\left(\{x_1,x_2\} \times \left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right]\right) \setminus \left\{\varepsilon\left(x_2,0\right)\right\},$$

is M-closed.

Conversely, if $\tilde{M} \subset ex\ K$ is M-closed, then $\tilde{\tilde{M}}$ is compact and M-extremal.

If $\varepsilon\left(x_0,0\right) \notin \tilde{\tilde{M}}$, then $\tilde{\tilde{M}} = \tilde{M}$, and $\tilde{M}$ is compact in the original topology; if $\varepsilon(x_0,0) \in \tilde{\tilde{M}}$ contains the set $\tilde{M_0}$. It follows that the maximal topology is strictly finer than the Choquet topology, in this case.

2) Moreover, there are M-continuous real functions on *ex* K, which are not C-continuous. Indeed, since *ex* K is not compact in the original topology, from the above description of the C-closed subsets of *ex* K, it follows that any C-continuous real function on *ex* K is constant. On the other hand, the M-continuous real functions on *ex* K, which have a "limit at infinity" (*ex* K is locally compact), are continuous for the original topology and are constant on the set $\tilde{M_0}$.

3) The preceding example can be used in order to show that, in general, the σ-algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{B}_1}\left(ex\ K;C\right)$ of subsets of *ex* K, generated by $\tilde{\mathcal{B}_0}(ex\ K)$ and $\mathcal{B}(ex\ K;C)$, is strictly included in the σ-algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{B}_1}(ex\ K;M)$ of subsets of *ex* K, generated by $\tilde{\mathcal{B}_0}(ex\ K)$ and $\mathcal{B}(ex\ K;M)$. It will follow that $\mathcal{B}(ex\ K;C)$ is strictly included in $\mathcal{B}(ex\ K;M)$.

In order to prove this, let us first remark that for any $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}_1}(ex\ K;C)$ there are Baire measurable subsets $B, B' \subset X \times \left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right]$, such that $\{(x_0,0),(x_2,0)\} \subset B$ and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \cap \varepsilon(B) = \varepsilon(B') \setminus \left\{\varepsilon(x_0,0\right\}.$$

By taking into account the characterization of the M-closed subsets of *ex* K, given above, with a suitable choice of the space X, one can find M-closed subsets of *ex* K, that are not in $\tilde{\mathcal{B}_1}\left(ex\ K;C\right)$. It follows that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}_1}\left(ex\ K;C\right) \subsetneqq \tilde{\mathcal{B}_1}\left(ex\ K;M\right).$$

Indeed, let us consider the compact space $X = [0,1]^{[0,1]}$ and the point $x_0 = (x_0(s))_{s\in[0,1]} \in X$, where $x_0(s) = 0$, $\forall s \in [0,1]$. Then the set $\varepsilon(M)]\left\{\varepsilon(x_0,0)\right\}$, where

$$M = \left\{(x,t) \in X \times \left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right]; x\left(s\right) \leq s, s \in [0,1]\right\},$$

is M-closed in $ex\ K = \varepsilon\left(X \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]\right) \setminus \{\varepsilon(x_0, 0)\}$. Of course, the points $x_1, x_2 \in X$, with $x_1 \neq x_2$, will be chosen such that

$$x_k(s) \leq s,\ s \in [0,1],\ k = 1, 2.$$

If B and B' are Baire measurable subsets of $X \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$, there is a countable subset $I \subset [0,1]$, such that

$$(x,t) \in B, y \in x, y(s) = x(s), \forall s \in I \Rightarrow (y,t) \in B$$

and

$$(x',t) \in b', y' \in x, y'(s) = x'(s), \forall s \in I \Rightarrow (y',t) \in B.$$

Although we have to consider only the Baire measurable subsets, B and B' of $X \times \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$ which have the properties

$$(x_0, 0) \in B \Leftrightarrow (x_2, 0) \in B, (x_0, 0) \in B' \Leftrightarrow (x_2, 0) \in B',$$

we have

$$(\varepsilon(M) \setminus \{\varepsilon(x_0,0)\}) \cap \varepsilon(B) \neq \varepsilon\left(B'\right) \setminus \{\varepsilon(x_0,0)\},$$

whenever $(x_0, 0) \in B$. It follows that

$$\varepsilon(M) \setminus \{\varepsilon(x_0,0)\} \notin \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(exK; C),$$

although $\varepsilon(M) \setminus \{\varepsilon(x_0,0)\}$ is M-closed.

3 Admissible mappings

Section 1

Let K_0, K_1 be compact convex subsets of Hausdorff locally convex topological real vector spaces.

A continuous affine mapping $r : K_0 \to K_1$ will be said to be *admissible* if

$$r(ex\ K_0) \subset ex\ K_1.$$

If K_0 is a compact convex subset of the compact convex set K_1 then K_0 will be said to be an admissible (compact convex) subset of K_1 if the inclusion mapping $i : K_0 \to K_1$ is admissible, i.e.,

$$ex\ K_0 \subset ex\ K_1.$$

3.1 Theorem. *If the continuous affine mapping $r : K_0 \to K_1$ is admissible, then the inclusion $r(K_0) \subset K_1$ is admissible.*

Proof. If $x_1 \in ex\ r(K_0)$, then there is an $x_0 \in ex\ K_0$, such that $r(x_0) = x_1$. It follows that $x_1 \in ex\ K_1$. □

3.2 Remark. The converse is not true.

3.3 Theorem. *Let K_0, K_1 be compact convex sets and let $r : K_0 \to K_1$ be any admissible affine continuous mapping. Then $\tilde{r} = r \mid (ex\ K_0)$ is continuous, if ex K_0 and ex K_1 are endowed with the corresponding Choquet topologies.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{F} \subset ex\ K_1$, be any C-closed subset. Then there exists a compact extremal subset $F \subset K_1$, such that

$$\tilde{F} = F \cap (ex\ K_1).$$

Since $r^{-1}(F)$ is a compact extremal subset of K_0, from the equality

$$r^{-1}(F) \cap (ex\ K_0) = \tilde{r}^{-1}\left(\tilde{F}\right)$$

we infer that $\tilde{r}^{-1}(\tilde{F})$ is C-closed in $ex\ K_0$. □

Since r is continuous, it is obvious that

$$B \in \mathcal{B}_0(K_1) \Rightarrow r^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{B}_0(K_0).$$

On the other hand, as above, we have

$$F \in \mathcal{F}(K_1) \Rightarrow r^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{F}(K_0).$$

It follows that

$$B \in \mathcal{B}_1(K_1; C) \Rightarrow r^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{B}_1(K_0; C).$$

From the formula

$$\tilde{r}^{-1}(B \cap (ex\ K_1)) = r^{-1}(B) \cap (ex\ K_0),$$

holding for any subset $B \subset K_1$, we infer that

$$\tilde{B} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K_1; C) \Rightarrow \tilde{r}^{-1}(\tilde{B}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K_0; C).$$

In particular, we have

$$\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}(ex\ K_1; C) \Rightarrow \tilde{r}^{-1}(\tilde{B}) \in \mathcal{B}(ex\ K_0; C);$$

i.e., $\tilde{r}$ is Borel-Choquet measurable, as it follows from Theorem 22.

Section 2.

Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}(K)$ be any σ-algebra of Borel subsets of the compact convex set K. A Radon probability measure μ on K will be said to be $\mathcal{A}$-pseudoconcentrated on $ex\ K$ if

$$(*) \quad A \in \mathcal{A},\ A \cap (ex\ K) = \emptyset \Rightarrow \mu(A) = 0.$$

It is easy to see that condition (*) is equivalent to

$$(**) \quad (\mu \mid \mathcal{A})^*(ex\ K) = 1,$$

and, therefore, one can define correctly a probability measure $\tilde{\mu} : \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \to [0,1]$ by

$$\tilde{\mu}(A \cap (ex\ K)) = \mu(A), \quad A \in \mathcal{A},$$

on the σ-algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ of subsets of $ex\ K$, given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \{A \cap (ex\ K); A \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

we can prove now

3.4 Theorem. *Let* μ_0 *be a Radon probability measure on the compact convex set* K_0*, and assume that it is* $\mathcal{B}_1(K_0;C)$*-pseudoconcentrated on ex* K_0*. Let* $r : K_0 \to K_1$ *be an admissible continuous affine mapping of* K_0 *into the compact convex set* K_1*. Then* $\mu_1 = r_*(\mu_0)$ *is* $\mathcal{B}_1(K_1;C)$*-pseudoconcentrated on ex* K_1 *and* $\tilde{\mu}_1 = \tilde{r}_*(\tilde{\mu}_0)$*.*

Proof. Let $M \in \mathcal{B}_1(K_1;C)$ be such that $M \cap (ex\ K_1) = \emptyset$. Then $r^{-1}(M) \in \mathcal{B}_1(K_0;C)$ and $r^{-1}(M) \cap (ex\ K_0) = \emptyset$. It follows that

$$\mu_1(M) = r_*(\mu_0) = \mu_0(r^{-1}(M)) = 0.$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu}_1(M \cap (ex\ K_1)) &= \mu_1(M) = \mu_0(r^{-1}(M)) = \tilde{\mu}_0(r^{-1}(M) \cap (ex\ K_0)) \\ &= \tilde{\mu}_0(\tilde{r}^{-1}(M \cap (ex\ K_1))) = \tilde{r}_*(\tilde{\mu}_0)(M \cap (ex\ K_1)),\end{aligned}$$

for any $M \in \mathcal{B}_1(K_1 : C)$. □

With the above notations we have the following:

3.5 Corollary. *Let* μ_0 *be any maximal Radon probability measure on* K_0*. Then* $r_*(\mu_0)$ *is* $\mathcal{B}_1(K_1;C)$*-pseudoconcentrated on ex* K_1*.*

Section 3.

For any mapping $r : K_0 \to K_1$ we shall denote by $\Gamma(r)$ its *graph*, given by

$$\Gamma(r) = \{(x, r(x)); x \in K_0\} \subset K_0 \times K_1.$$

We shall also denote by $p_0 : K_0 \times K_1 \to K_0$ the canonical projection onto the first factor, and by $p_1 : K_0 \times K_1 \to K_1$ the canoncial projection onto the second factor. It is obvious that $K_0 \times K_1$ is a compact convex subset of the Hausdorff locally convex topological real vector space $E_0 \times E_1$, if K_i is a compact convex subset of the Hausdorff locally convex topological real vector space E_i, $i = 0, 1$.

3.6 Theorem. *Let* K_0 *and* K_1 *be compact convex sets. Then*

a) ex $(K_0 \times K_1) = (ex\ K_0) \times (ex\ K_1)$*;*

b) The projections $p_0 : K_0 \times K_1 \to K_0$ *and* $p_1 : K_0 \times K_1 \to K_1$ *are admissible;*

c) A continuous affine mapping

$$r : K_0 \to K_1$$

is admissible if, and only if, the inclusion $\Gamma(r) \subset K_0 \times K_1$ *is admissible.*

Proof. a) Immediate.

b) Follows from a) immediately.

c) Follows immediately from a) and from the fact that $p_0 \mid \Gamma(r) : \Gamma(r) \to K_0$ is an affine homeomorphism. □

We have the following:

3.7 Corollary. *If* $r : K_0 \to K_1$ *is any continuous affine mapping, then the following are equivalent.*

a) r *is admissible,*

b) ex $\Gamma(r) = (\Gamma(r)) \cap (ex(K_0 \times K_1))$*, and also*

3.8 Corollary. *The identity mapping*

$$I : ex(K_0 \times K_1) \to (ex\ K_0) \times (ex\ K_1),$$

as determined by Theorem 24, a), is continuous if all three spaces are equipped with the corresponding Choquet topologies.

The following theorem describes the structure of the compact extremal subsets of the direct product $K_0 \times \dot{K}_1$ of two compact convex sets K_0 and K_1.

3.9 Theorem. *a) If $F \subset K_0 \times K_1$ is a (compact) face, then $p_0(F) \subset K_0$ and $p_1(F) \subset K_1$ are (compact) faces in the corresponding compact convex sets, and $F = p_0(F) \times p_1(F)$.*

b) If $F_0 \subset K_0$ and $F_1 \subset K_1$ are (compact) faces in the corresponding compact convex sets, then $F_0 \times F_1$ is a (compact) face in $K_0 \times K_1$.

c) If $F \subset K_0 \times K_1$ is a (compact) extremal subset, then there exist two families $(F^0_\alpha)_{\alpha\in I}$ and $(F^1_\alpha)_{\alpha\in I}$ of (compact) faces, in the corresponding compact convex sets K_0 and K_1 (i.e., $F^0_\alpha \subset K_0$ and $F^1_\alpha \subset K_1$ are (compact) faces, $\alpha \in I$), such that $F = \bigcup\limits_\alpha (F^0_\alpha \times F^1_\alpha)$.

d) If $F^0_\alpha \subset K_0$, $F^1_\alpha \subset K_1$, $\alpha \in I$, are any two families of faces of the corresponding compact convex sets, over the same set of indices, then $\bigcup\limits_\alpha (F^0_\alpha \times F^1_\alpha)$ is an extremal subset of $K_0 \times K_1$.

Proof. a) Let $F \subset K_0 \times K_1$ be any face. Then $p_0(F)$ is a face of K_0 and $p_1(F)$ is a face of K_1. Indeed, it is obvious that they are convex subsets of K_0, respectively K_1. Let us prove that $p_0(F)$ is a face of K_0. Indeed, let $x_0 \in p_0(F)$ and assume that

$$x_0 = tx_0' + (1-t)x_0'',\ 0 \subset t \subset 1,\ x_0', x_0'' \in K_0.$$

Then there exists an $x_1 \in K_1$, such that

$$(x_0, x_1) \in F.$$

Since $(x_0, x_1) = t(x_0', x_1) + (1-t)(x_0'', x_1)$, it follows that $(x_0', x_1) \in F$ and $(x_0'', x_1) \in F$. This implies now that $x_0', x_0'' \in p_0(F)$.

It is obvious that $F \subset p_0(F) \times p_1(F)$. Let now $(x_0, x_1) \in p_0(F) \times p_1(F)$. Then there exist $x_1' \in K_1$ and $x_0' \in K_0$, such that $(x_0, x_1') \in F$ and $(x_0', x_1) \in F$. Since F is convex, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{2}\left[(x_0, x_1') + (x_0', x_1)\right] \in F.$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{2}\left[(x_0, x_1') + (x_0', x_1)\right] = \frac{1}{2}\left[(x_0, x_1) + (x_0', x_1')\right],$$

we infer that $(x_0, x_1) \in F$.

b) If $F_0 \subset K_0$ and $F_1 \subset K_1$ are (compact) faces in K_0, respectively K_1, then $p_0^{-1}(F_0) = F_0 \times K_1$ and $p_1^{-1}(F_1) = K_0 \times F_1$ are (compact) extremal convex subsets of $K_0 \times K_1$; i.e., they are (compact) faces of $K_0 \times K_1$. It follows that

$$F_0 \times F_1 = p_0^{-1}(F_0) \cap p_1^{-1}(F_1)$$

is a (compact) face of $K_0 {\times}_1$.

c) Let $F \subset K_0 \times K_1$ be any (compact) extremal subset of $K_0 \times K_1$. As remarked by Balty (see [3], p. 298), and the result can be obtained as a nice exercise in elementary geometry, any extremal subset of a convex set is a union of faces (the converse is easily shown to be true). Also, as remarked by Teleman (see [24]), any compact extremal subset of a compact convex set is a union of compact faces.

Let then $F = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha} F_\alpha$ be such a decomposition, where F_α is a face of $K_0 \times K_1$, for any $\alpha \in I$. If F is compact, one can assume that all the sets F_α, $\alpha \in I$, are compact faces. Denoting $F_\alpha^0 = p_0(F_\alpha)$, $F_\alpha^1 = p_1(F_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in I$, by a) we have

$$F = \bigcup_{\alpha} \left(F_\alpha^0 \times F_\alpha^1\right).$$

d) This follows from b) and from the fact that any union of extremal sets is an extremal set. □

3.10 Corollary. *For any (compact) extremal subset $F \subset K_0 \times K_1$, the subsets $p_0(F) \subset K_0$ and $p_1(F) \subset K_1$ are (compact) extremal subsets of the corresponding compact convex sets.*

Proof. By part c) of the above Theorem, we have

$$p_0\left(F\right) = \bigcup_{\alpha} F_\alpha^0 \text{ and } p_1\left(F\right) = \bigcup_{\alpha} F_\alpha^1,$$

and the assertion immediately follows. □

3.11 Corollary. *The canonical projections*

$$\tilde{p}_0 : ex\left(K_0 \times K_1\right) \to ex\ K_0$$

and

$$\tilde{p}_1 : ex\left(K_0 \times K_1\right) \to ex\ K_1$$

are continuous and closed for the corresponding Choquet topologies.

Proof. The continuity was already established (Theorem 22 and Theorem 24, b)). Let now $\tilde{F} \subset ex\left(K_0 \times K_1\right)$ be any C-closed subset. Then there exists a (smallest) compact extremal subset $F \subset K_0 \times K_1$, such that $F \cap ex\left(K_0 \times K_1\right) = \tilde{F}$. By Theorem 25, it follows that

$$F = \bigcup_{\alpha} \left(F_\alpha^0 \times F_\alpha^1\right),$$

where $F_\alpha^0 \subset K_0$ and $F_\alpha^1 \subset K_1$, $\alpha \in I$, are compact faces. We have that

$$p_0\left(F\right) = \bigcup_{\alpha} F_\alpha^0,\ p_1\left(F\right) = \bigcup_{\alpha} F_\alpha^1,$$

which are compact extremal subsets of K_0, respectively K_1, and, therefore,

$$\tilde{p}_0\left(\tilde{F}\right) = p_0\left(F\right) \cap \left(ex\ K_0\right),$$

$$\tilde{p}_1\left(\tilde{F}\right) = p_1\left(F\right) \cap \left(ex\ K_1\right),$$

are C-closed subsets of $ex\ K_0$, respectively $ex\ K_1$. □

Section 4

We shall now assume that $r : K_0 \to K_1$ is an admissible continuous affine mapping. We shall denote by ρ the inclusion of $\Gamma(r)$ in $K_0 \times K_1$, which is an admissible continuous affine mapping $\rho : \Gamma(r) \to K_0 \times K_1$, and we shall also consider the mapping $R : K_0 \to \Gamma(r)$, given by $R(x_0) = (x_0, r(x_0))$, $x_0 \in K_0$. Then R is an affine homeomorphism of K_0 onto $\Gamma(r)$. The mapping $\tilde{R} : ex\ K_0 \to \Gamma(\tilde{r})$, given by $\tilde{R}(x_0) = (x_0, r(x_0))$, $x_0 \in ex\ K_0$, is a bijection of $ex\ K_0$ onto

$$\Gamma(\tilde{r}) = ex\ \Gamma(r) = \Gamma(r) \cap ex(K_0 \times K_1).$$

The set $\Gamma(r)$ is compact and convex (affinely and homeomorphically isomorphic with K_0), and as such the set

$$ex\ \Gamma(r) = \Gamma(\tilde{r})$$

is endowed with its Choquet topology, inherited from $\Gamma(r)$. It is obvious that the mapping $\tilde{R}$ is a homeomorphism of $ex\ K_0$, endowed with the Choquet topology inherited from K_0, onto $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, endowed with the Choquet topology inherited from $\Gamma(r)$. However, we can also consider on $\Gamma(r)$ the topology induced by the Choquet topology of $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$, inherited from $K_0 \times K_1$.

3.12 Theorem. *a) For any (compact) extremal subset $F \subset K_0 \times K_1$, decomposed as a union*

$$F = \bigcup_{\alpha} (F^0_\alpha \times F^1_\alpha)$$

of direct products of (compact) faces $F^0_\alpha \subset K_0$, $F^1_\alpha \subset K_1$, $\alpha \in A$, in the corresponding compact convex sets, the set

$$F_0 = \bigcup_{\alpha} (F^0_\alpha \cap r^{-1}(F^1_\alpha))$$

is a (compact) extremal subset of K_0 and

$$(*) \quad F \cap \Gamma(r) = R(F_0).$$

b) For any (compact) extremal subset F_0 of $\Gamma(r)$, the set $p_0^{-1}(p_0(F_0))$ is a (compact) extremal subset of $K_0 \times K_1$ and

$$(**) \quad F_0 = \Gamma(r) \cap p_0^{-1}(p_0(F_0)).$$

Proof. a) Since $r^{-1}(F^1_\alpha)$ is a (compact) face of K_0, for any $\alpha \in I$, it follows that

$$F^0_\alpha \cap r^{-1}(F^1_\alpha)$$

is a (compact) face of K_0, for any $\alpha \in A$. It follows that F_0 is an extremal subset of K_0.

Let us now assume that F is compact; we shall prove that F_0 is compact. Indeed, let $(x^0_i)_i$ be a generalized sequence in K_0, such that

$$x^0_i \in F^0_{\alpha_i} \cap r^{-1}(F^1_{\alpha_i}),\ i \in I,$$

and $\lim_i x^0_i = x_0$. Then $r(x^0_i) \in F^1_{\alpha_i}$, $i \in I$, and $\lim_i r(x^0_i) = r(x_0)$. We have

$$(x^0_i, r(x^0_i)) \in F^0_{\alpha_i} \times F^1_{\alpha} \subset F,$$

and this implies that $(x_0, r(x_0)) \in F$, by the compactness of F. It follows that there exists an $\alpha_0 \in A$, such that $(x_0, r(x_0)) \in F^0_{\alpha_0} \times F^1_{\alpha_0}$; hence,

$$x_0 \in F^0_{\alpha_0} \cap r^{-1}(F^1_{\alpha_0}) \subset F_0.$$

Let us now prove equality (*). Indeed, any $(x_0, x_1) \in R(F_0)$ is of the form $x_1 = r(x_0)$, $x_0 \in F_0$. This shows that there exists an $\alpha \in A$, such that $x_0 \in F^0_\alpha \cap r^{-1}(F^1_\alpha)$. It follows that $R(x_0) = (x_0, r(x_0)) \in F \cap \Gamma(r)$.

Conversely, for any $(x_0, r(x_0)) \in F \cap \Gamma(r)$, we have an $\alpha \in A$, such that $(x_0, r(x_0)) \in F^0_\alpha \times F^1_\alpha$. This shows that $x_0 \in F^0_\alpha \cap r^{-1}(F^1_\alpha) \subset F_0$. Then $(x_0, r(x_0)) = R(x_0) \in R(F_0)$.

b) This immediately follows from the fact that $p_0 \mid \Gamma(r)$ is an affine homeomorphic isomorphism between $\Gamma(r)$ and K_0. □

3.13 Corollary. *a) The topology induced on $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$ by the Choquet topology of $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$, inherited from $K_0 \times K_1$, coincides with the Choquet topology of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, inherited from $\Gamma(r)$.*

b) The restriction $\tilde{p}_0 \mid \Gamma(\tilde{r})$ is a homeomorphism, from the space $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, equipped with the topology induced by the Choquet topology of $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$, inherited from $K_0 \times K_1$, onto the space ex K_0, equipped with the Choquet topology inherited from K_0.

c) The mapping $\tilde{R} : ex\ K_0 \to ex(K_0 \times K_1)$ is a homeomorphism from the space ex K_0, endowed with the Choquet topology, inherited from K_0, into the space $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$, endowed with the Choquet topology inherited from $K_0 \times K_1$.

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of the preceding Theorem. □

We also have the following.

3.14 Corollary. *The σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma(\tilde{r}); C)$ of all Borel measurable subsets of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, endowed with the Choquet topology of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, inherited from $\Gamma(r)$, coincides with the σ-algebra of all traces on $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$ of the Borel measurable subsets of $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$, generated by the Choquet topology of $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$; i.e.,*

$$\mathcal{B}(\Gamma(\tilde{r}); C) = \left\{ \tilde{B} \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r}); B \in \mathcal{B}(ex(K_0 \times K_1); C) \right\}.$$

Proof. By the preceding Corollary, part a), $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$ is a subspace of $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$. □

3.15 Remark. 1) $\tilde{R} = (\tilde{p}_0 \mid \Gamma(\tilde{r}))^{-1}$ and $R = (p_0 \mid \Gamma(r))^{-1}$.

2) If $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$ would be a C-closed subset of $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$, then it would be easy to prove now that for any maximal Radon probability measure μ_0 on K_0, the measure $\mu = R_*(\mu_0)$, which is supported by $\Gamma(r)$ and is maximal on $\Gamma(r)$, is also maximal on $K_0 \times K_1$. Since

$$r_*(\mu_0) = (p_1)_*(p_*(R_*(\mu_0))),$$

this would give an easier proof for the maximality of $r_*(\mu_0)$ on K_1 (see Theorem 28 below).

Unfortunately, in general, $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$ is not a C-closed subset of $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$ and so the following, more difficult proof seems to be unavoidable.

3.16 Theorem. *Let $r : K_0 \to K_1$ be an admissible continuous affine mapping and let μ be a maximal Radon probability measure on K_0. Then the measure*

$$\tilde{r}_*(\tilde{\mu}_0) \mid \mathcal{B}(ex\ K_1; C)$$

is τ-smooth.

Proof. Let $(\tilde{F}^1_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A}$ be a decreasing set of C-closed subsets of $ex\ K_1$. Let $F^1_\alpha \subset K_1$ be the smallest compact extremal subset of K_1, such that $F^1_\alpha \cap (ex\ K_1) = \tilde{F}^1_\alpha$, $\alpha \in A$. Then $(F^1_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a decreasing set of compact extremal subsets of K_1, and we have, therefore,

$$r_*(\mu_0)(\bigcap_\alpha F^1_\alpha) = \inf\left\{r_*(\mu_0)(F^1_\alpha); \alpha \in A\right\},$$

which implies that

$$\tilde{r}_*(\tilde{\mu}_0)(\bigcap_\alpha \tilde{F}^1_\alpha) = r_*(\mu_0)(\bigcap_\alpha F^1_\alpha) = \inf\left\{r_*(\mu_0)(F^1_\alpha); \alpha \in A\right\} = \inf\left\{\tilde{r}_*(\tilde{\mu}_0)(\tilde{F}^1_\alpha); \alpha \in A\right\},$$

by Theorem 5. □

3.17 Theorem. *Let K_0 and K_1 be any compact convex sets and let*

$$p_0 : K_0 \times K_1 \to K_0,\ p_1 : K_0 \times K_1 \to K_1$$

be the canonical projections. For any maximal Radon probability measure ν on $K_0 \times K_1$, the measure $(p_0)_*(\nu)$ is maximal on K_0 and $(p_1)_*(\nu)$ is maximal on K_1.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in S(K_0)$. Then we have

$$\hat{\varphi} \circ p_0 = (\varphi \circ p_0)\hat{}, \text{ on } K_0 \times K_1.$$

Indeed, since $\varphi \circ p_0 \le \hat{\varphi} \circ p_0$ and since $\hat{\varphi} \circ p_0$ is concave and upper semicontinuous on $K_0 \times K_1$, it follows that

$$(1)\quad (\varphi \circ p_0)\hat{} \le \hat{\varphi} \circ p_0.$$

Let now $(x_0, x_1) \in K_0 \times K_1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then there exists a measure $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}^1_+(K_0)$, such that

$$(1\prime)\qquad \hat{\varphi}(x_0) - \varepsilon < \mu_0(\varphi)$$

and $b(\mu_0) = x_0$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^1_+(K_0 \times K_1)$ be such that

$$(p_0)_*(\mu) = \mu_0 \text{ and } b(\mu) = (x_0, x_1).$$

It follows that

$$(2)\quad \mu_0(\varphi) = \mu(\varphi \circ p_0) \le (\varphi \circ p_0)\hat{}(x_0, x_1).$$

From (1′) and (2) we infer that

$$(3)\quad (\hat{\varphi} \circ p_0)(x_0, x_1) \le (\varphi \circ p_0)\hat{}(x_0, x_1),$$

for any $(x_0, x_1) \in K_0 \times K_1$. From (1) and (3) we get that

$$\hat{\varphi} \circ p_0 = (\varphi \circ p_0)\hat{}, \text{ on } K_0 \times K_1.$$

We now have

$$(p_0)_*(\nu)(\varphi) = \nu(\varphi \circ p_0) = \nu((\varphi \circ p_0)\hat{}) = \nu(\hat{\varphi} \circ p_0) = (p_0)_*(\nu)(\hat{\varphi}),$$

for any $\varphi \in S(K_0)$; this proves the maximality of $(p_0)_*(\nu)$.

Similar proof for $(p_1)_*(\nu)$. □

Section 5.

Let μ_0 be any maximal Radon probablity measure on K_0 and define

$$\mu = R_*(\mu_0),$$

where $R : K_0 \to \Gamma(r)$ is the mapping given by $R(x_0) = (x_0, r(x_0))$, $x_0 \in K_0$.

As above, let $\rho : \Gamma(r) \to K_0 \times K_1$ be the inclusion mapping. We shall prove that $\rho_*(\mu)$ is maximal on $K_0 \times K_1$. From Theorem 28 it will follow that

$$r_*(\mu_0) = (p_1)_*(\rho_*(\mu))$$

is maximal on K_1.

For any subset $M \subset ex(K_0 \times K_1)$ we shall denote by $\overline{M}^{\,C}$ its closure in $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$, with respect to the Choquet topology, inherited from $K_0 \times K_1$.

We note that we have

$$(*) \quad \Gamma(r) \cap ex(K_0 \times K_1) = ex\ \Gamma(r) = \Gamma(\tilde{r});$$

we shall consider the C-closed subset $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C}$ of $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$, and the admissible inclusion mapping $\rho : \Gamma(r) \to K_0 \times K_1$, whose restriction to $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$ will be denoted by $\tilde{\rho}$:

$$\tilde{\rho} = \rho \mid \Gamma(\tilde{r}) : \Gamma(\tilde{r}) \to ex(K_0 \times K_1).$$

Of course, $\tilde{\rho}$ is the inclusion

$$\Gamma(\tilde{r}) = \Gamma(r) \cap (ex(K_0 \times K_1)) \subset ex(K_0 \times K_1).$$

We distinguish between

1. the measure $\tilde{\mu}$, induced on $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ \Gamma(r); C)$ by μ, which is maximal on $\Gamma(r)$, and
2. the measure $\tilde{p}_*(\tilde{\mu})$, for which

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\mu)(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}) = \tilde{\mu}(\Gamma(\tilde{r}) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}}), \tilde{\mathcal{B}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex(K_0 \times K_1); C).$$

We shall prove now

3.18 Theorem. *Let $(\tilde{M}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a family of (relatively) C-closed subsets of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, such that*

$$\bigcap_\alpha \tilde{M}_\alpha = \emptyset.$$

Then, for their closures $\overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^{C}$ in $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$, we have

$$\bigcap_\alpha \overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^{C} = \emptyset.$$

Proof. For any α there is a smallest compact extremal subset $M_\alpha \subset \Gamma(r)$, such that

$$\tilde{M}_\alpha = M_\alpha \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r}) = M_\alpha \cap ex(K_0 \times K_1),\ \forall \alpha \in A.$$

Since $p_0 \mid \Gamma(r)$ is an affine homeomorphism of $\Gamma(r)$ onto K_0, we have that $p_0(M_\alpha)$ is a compact extremal subset of K_0 and

$$\bigcap_\alpha p_0(M_\alpha) = \emptyset.$$

It follows that $p_0(M_\alpha) \times K_1$ is a compact extremal subset of $K_0 \times K_1$, such that

$$M_\alpha = (p_0(M_\alpha) \times K_1) \cap \Gamma(r), \ \ \forall \alpha \in A,$$

and

$$\bigcap_\alpha (p_0(M_\alpha) \times K_1) = \emptyset.$$

Let F_α be the smallest compact extremal subset of $K_0 \times K_1$, such that $\tilde{M}_\alpha \subset F_\alpha$; of course, we have

$$F_\alpha \subset p_0(M_\alpha) \times K_1, \ \ \forall \alpha \in A,$$

and, therefore,

$$\bigcap_\alpha F_\alpha = \emptyset.$$

On the other hand, it is easy to show that

$$F_\alpha \cap ex(K_0 \times K_1) = (M_\alpha \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r}))^{-C} = \overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^C, \ \ \forall \alpha \in A.$$

□

3.19 Corollary. *Let* $(\tilde{M}_\alpha)_\alpha$ *be a family of subsets of* $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, *whose clsoures in* $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$ *are disjoint*

$$\Gamma(\tilde{r}) \cap (\bigcap_\alpha \overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^C) = \emptyset.$$

Then $\bigcap_\alpha \overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^C = \emptyset.$

Proof. The closure of $\tilde{M}_\alpha$ in $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$ is the set $\overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^C \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r})$. □

From the formula

$$\left(\bigcap_\alpha \overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^C\right) \cup \left(\bigcap_\beta \overline{\tilde{N}_\beta}^C\right) = \bigcap_{\alpha,\beta} \left(\overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^C \cup \overline{\tilde{N}_\beta}^C\right) = \bigcap_{\alpha,\beta} \left(\tilde{M}_\alpha \cup \tilde{N}_\beta\right)^{-C},$$

which holds for any families $(\tilde{M}_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(\tilde{N}_\beta)_\beta$ of subsets of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, we immediately infer that the set of all the subsets of $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$, of the form

$$\bigcap_\alpha \overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha},$$

for all families $(\tilde{M}_\alpha)_\alpha$ of subsets of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, is the set of all closed sets of a topology on $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$, which we shall denote by τ. Of course, τ is coarser than the topology induced on $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$ by the Choquet topology of $ex(K_0 \times K_1)$; therefore,

$$\mathcal{B}\left(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau\right) \subset \mathcal{B}\left(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; C\right).$$

Section 6.

Let ν be any maximal Radon probability measure on $K_0 \times K_1$, such that $\rho_*(\mu) < \nu$. We shall prove that $\rho_*(\mu) = \nu$, which will establish the maximality of $\rho_*(\mu)$ on $K_0 \times K_1$.

Indeed, let $F_1 \subset K_0 \times K_1$ be the smallest compact extremal subset of $K_0 \times K_1$, such that $F_1 \supset \Gamma(\tilde{r})$. Then

$$F_1 \cap ex(K_0 \times K_1) = \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C}.$$

Since $\rho_*(\mu) < \nu$, we infer that

$$(1) \quad \rho_*(\mu)(F_1) \leq \nu(F_1).$$

However

$$\rho_*(\mu)(F_1) = \mu(F_1 \cap \Gamma(r))$$

and, since $F_1 \cap \Gamma(r)$ is a compact extremal subset of $\Gamma(r)$, such that

$$F_1 \cap \Gamma(r) \supset ex\Gamma(r),$$

we infer that

$$(2) \quad \rho_*(\mu)(F_1) = \mu(F_1 \cap \Gamma(r)) = 1.$$

From (1) and (2) we get that

$$\nu(F_1) = 1,$$

and this shows that

$$(3) \quad \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C}) = \tilde{\nu}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C}) = 1.$$

This formula will allow us to consider, from now on, that the measures $\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})$ and $\tilde{\nu}$ are restricted to $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C}$, i.e., we shall consider the "restrictions"

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu}) : \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C}; C) \to [0,1]$$

and

$$\tilde{\nu} : \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C}; C) \to [0,1]\,,$$

which are probability measures.

We have

$$(*) \quad \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}) \leq \tilde{\nu}(\tilde{F}),$$

for any C-closed subset $\tilde{F} \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C}$.

From Theorem 5 we infer that the measure $\tilde{\nu}$ is regular on $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C}; C)$. However, property (*) does not ensure the regularity of $\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})$.

3.20 Example. Let X be a set whose cordinal is measurable, i.e., there exists a probability measure

$$\lambda : \mathcal{P}(X) \to \{0,1\}\,,$$

such that $\lambda(\{X\}) = 0$, for any $x \in X$. Endow X with the discrete topology and let X_0 be the Aleksandrov compactification of X :

$$X_0 = X \cup \{\omega\}\,,$$

where $\omega \notin X$, and the open sets of X_0 are the subsets of X and the complements in X_0 of the finite subsets of X. Define $\lambda_0 : \mathcal{P}(X_0) \to \{0,1\}$ by

$$\lambda_0(B) = \lambda(B \cap X), \quad B \in \mathcal{P}(X_0),$$

and let λ_1 be the Dirac measure at ω. Then $\lambda_0(F) \leq \lambda_1(F)$, for any closed subset $F \subset X_0$, λ_1 is regular, but λ_0 is not regular.

3.21 Theorem. *a)* $\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu}) \mid \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau)$ *is regular.*

b) The topology τ *on* $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$ *induces on* $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$ *the Choquet topology.*

Proof. a) Let $\tilde{F} \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$ be a τ-closed subset

$$\tilde{F} = \bigcap_\alpha \overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^C,$$

where $\tilde{M}_\alpha \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r})$, $\alpha \in A$, and (relatively) C-closed subsets of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$. We then have

$$\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C \backslash F = \bigcup_\alpha \left(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C \backslash \overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^C \right)$$

and

$$\Gamma(\tilde{r}) \cap \left(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C \backslash \tilde{F} \right) = \bigcup_\alpha \left(\Gamma(\tilde{r}) \backslash \tilde{M}_\alpha \right),$$

which is a (relatively) C-open subset of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$. Since $\tilde{\mu}$ is regular by C-closed subsets on $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a (relatively) C-closed subset $\tilde{F}_0 \subset \Gamma(\tilde{r})$, such that

i) $\tilde{F}_0 \subset \bigcup_\alpha \left(\Gamma(\tilde{r}) \backslash \tilde{M}_\alpha \right)$ and

ii) $\tilde{\mu}\left(\bigcup_\alpha (\Gamma(\tilde{r}) \backslash \tilde{M}_\alpha) \right) - \varepsilon < \tilde{\mu}\left(\tilde{F}_0 \right)$.

It follows that

$$\tilde{F}_0 \cap \left(\bigcap_\alpha \tilde{M}_\alpha \right) = \emptyset,$$

and, therefore, by Theorem 29, we get that

$$\overline{\tilde{F}_0}^C \cap \tilde{F} = \overline{\tilde{F}_0}^C \cap \left(\bigcap_\alpha \overline{\tilde{M}_\alpha}^C \right) = \emptyset.$$

We infer that

$$1 - \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}) - \varepsilon < \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\overline{\tilde{F}_0}^C)$$

and this shows that

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{U}) = \sup \left\{ \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{F}); \tilde{F} \subset \tilde{U},\ \tau\text{-closed} \right\}$$

for any τ-open subset $\tilde{U} \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$.

b) For any relatively C-closed subset $\tilde{F}_0 \subset \Gamma(\tilde{r})$ we have

$$\overline{\tilde{F}_0}^C \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r}) = \tilde{F}_0,$$

and for any τ-closed subset $\tilde{F} \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$, we have

$$\tilde{F} = \bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C,$$

where $\tilde{F}_\alpha \subset \Gamma(\tilde{r})$ are relatively C-closed subsets of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, $\alpha \in A$. We infer that

$$\tilde{F} \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r}) = \bigcap_{\alpha} \tilde{F}_\alpha,$$

which is a relatively C-closed subset of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$.

c) We infer that

$$\left\{\tilde{B} \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r}); \tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}\left(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C\right); \tau\right\} = \mathcal{B}\left(\Gamma(\tilde{r}); C\right).$$

d) Let us now define $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}\left(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau\right)$ to be the set of all sets $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}\left(\overline{\Gamma\left(\tilde{r}\right)^C; \tau}\right)$, such that

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{B}) = \sup\left\{(\tilde{\rho})_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}); \tilde{F} \subset \tilde{B},\ \tau\text{-closed}\right\}$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\complement\tilde{B}) = \sup\left\{(\tilde{\rho})_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}); \tilde{F} \subset \complement\tilde{B},\quad \tau\text{-closed}\right\},$$

where the complement is taken with respect to $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$.

Then

d') If $\tilde{F} \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$ is τ-closed, then $\tilde{F} \in \mathcal{A}$; obvious.

d") If $\tilde{A} \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\complement\tilde{A} \in \mathcal{A}$, obvious.

d"') If $\tilde{A}_n \in \mathcal{A}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\bigcup\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{A}_n \in \mathcal{A}$.

Indeed, given $\varepsilon > 0$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a τ-closed subset $\tilde{F}_n \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$, such that

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{A}_n) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{n+1}} < \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}_n)$$

and

$$\tilde{F}_n \subset \tilde{A}_n, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Then

$$\left(\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{A}_n\right) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{F}_n\right) \subset \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\tilde{A}_n \backslash \tilde{F}_n\right)$$

and, therefore,

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})\left(\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{A}_n\right) - \varepsilon < \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})\left(\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{F}_n\right);$$

it follows that there exists an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})\left(\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{A}_n\right) - \varepsilon < \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})\left(\bigcup_{n=0}^{n_0} \tilde{F}_n\right),$$

and

$$\bigcup_{n=0}^{n_0} \tilde{F}_n \subset \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n$$

is a τ-closed subset of $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$.

On the other hand, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a τ-closed subset $\tilde{H}_n$ of $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$, such that

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\complement \tilde{A}_n) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{n+1}} < \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{H}_n)$$

and

$$\tilde{H}_n \subset \complement \tilde{A}_n, \; n \geq 0.$$

Then

$$\left(\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \complement \tilde{A}_n\right) \setminus \left(\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{H}_n\right) \subset \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\left(\complement \tilde{A}_n\right) \setminus \tilde{H}_n\right),$$

and, therefore,

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu}) \left(\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \complement \tilde{A}_n\right) - \varepsilon < \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu}) \left(\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{H}_n\right)$$

and

$$\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{H}_n \subset \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \complement \tilde{A}_n;$$

of course, $\bigcap\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} H_n$ is a τ-closed subset of $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$.

It follows that $\mathcal{A}$ is a σ-subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau)$, which contains all τ-closed subsets of $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$, and this shows that

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}\left(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau\right).$$

It follows that $\tilde{\rho}_*(\mu) \setminus \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau)$ is regular by τ-closed subsets and the Theorem is proved. $\square$

Section 7.

We shall consider now the following restrictions

$$\hat{\mu} = \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu}) \setminus \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau)$$

and

$$\hat{\nu} = \tilde{\nu} \setminus \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau).$$

We can prove now

3.22 Theorem. $\hat{\mu} = \hat{\nu}$.

Proof. We remind (see [7], p. 36) that a π-system is any set $\mathcal{P}$ of subsets of a set Ω (of $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$, in our case) such that

$$(\pi) \quad A,\, B \in \mathcal{P} \Longrightarrow A \cap B \in \mathcal{P};\; \Omega \in \mathcal{P}.$$

A λ-system is any set $\mathcal{L}$ of subsets of a set Ω (of $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$, in our case), such that

(λ') $\Omega \in \mathcal{L}$;

(λ") $A \in \mathcal{L} \Longrightarrow \complement A \in \mathcal{L}$;

(λ"') $A_n \in \mathcal{L}$, $n \geq 0$, and $A_m \cap A_n = \emptyset$ for $m \neq n \Longrightarrow \bigcup\limits_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{L}$.

Then (Dynkin's Theorem):

If $\mathcal{P}$ is a π-system and if $\mathcal{L}$ is a λ-system, then $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{L} \Longrightarrow \sigma(\mathcal{P}) \subset \mathcal{L}$ (here $\sigma(\mathcal{P})$ is the σ-algebra generated by $\mathcal{P}$).

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of all τ-closed subsets of $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$ and let $\mathcal{L}$ be the set

$$\mathcal{L} = \left\{ \tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau); \hat{\mu}(\tilde{B}) = \hat{\nu}(\hat{B}) \right\}.$$

It is obvious that $\mathcal{P}$ is a π-system, and $\mathcal{L}$ is a λ-system. Let us prove the inclusion

$$\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{L}.$$

Indeed, any τ-closed subset $\tilde{F} \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$ is of the form

$$\tilde{F} = \bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha},$$

where $\tilde{F}_{\alpha} \subset \Gamma(\tilde{r})$ is a (relatively) C-closed subset of $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$.

Since $\tilde{\mu}$ is regular on $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma(\tilde{r}); C)$, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a (relatively) C-closed subset $\tilde{F}_0 \subset \Gamma(\tilde{r})$, such that

$$\tilde{F}_0 \cap \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \tilde{F}_{\alpha} \right) = \emptyset$$

and

$$1 - \varepsilon < \tilde{\mu} \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \tilde{F}_{\alpha} \right) + \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F}_0).$$

It follows that

$$1 - \varepsilon < \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu}) \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C \right) + \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\overline{\tilde{F}}_0^C)$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu}) \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C \right) \leq \tilde{\nu} \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C \right),$$

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\overline{\tilde{F}}_0) \leq \tilde{\nu}(\overline{\tilde{F}}_0).$$

Since, according to Theorem 29,

$$\overline{\tilde{F}}_0^C \cap \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C \right) = \emptyset,$$

we infer that

$$\tilde{\nu}(\overline{\tilde{F}}_0^C) + \tilde{\nu} \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{a}^C \right) = \tilde{\nu} \left(\overline{\tilde{F}}_0^C \cup \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C \right) \right) \leq 1.$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu}) \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C \right) \leq \tilde{\nu} \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C \right) < \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu}) \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C \right) + \varepsilon$$

and this shows that

$$\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu}) \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C \right) = \tilde{\nu} \left(\bigcap_{\alpha} \overline{\tilde{F}}_{\alpha}^C \right);$$

i.e.,

$$\hat{\mu}\left(\bigcap_{\alpha}\overline{\tilde{F}_{\alpha}}^{C}\right)=\tilde{\nu}\left(\bigcap_{\alpha}\overline{\tilde{F}_{\alpha}}^{C}\right).$$

From Dynkin's Theorem we infer that

$$\mathcal{B}\left(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C};\tau\right)\subset\mathcal{L},$$

and the Theorem is proved. □

3.23 Theorem. *Let K be a compact convex set and let $\tilde{M}\subset ex\ K$. Let $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})$ be the smallest compact extremal subset of K, such that $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})\supset\tilde{M}$. Then*

$$\overline{\tilde{M}}=ex\ \mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})=\mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})\cap(ex\ K)$$

(here $\overline{\tilde{M}}$ denotes the closure of $\tilde{M}$ with respect to the Choquet topology of $ex\ K$).

Proof. Since $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})$ is a compact extremal subset of K, such that $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})\supset\tilde{M}$, we have that

$$ex\ \mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})=\mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})\cap(ex\ K)\supset\tilde{M};$$

since $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})\cap(ex\ K)$ is a C-closed subset of $ex\ K$, we infer that

$$ex\ \mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})\supset\overline{\tilde{M}}^{C}.$$

Conversely, since $\overline{\tilde{M}}^{C}$ is a C-closed subset of $ex\ K$, there exists a compact extremal subset $F\subset K$, such that

$$F\cap(ex\ K)=\overline{\tilde{M}}^{C}.$$

It follows that $F\supset\tilde{M}$ and, therefore, $F\supset\mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})$. This implies that

$$\overline{\tilde{M}}\supset\mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})\cap(ex\ K)=ex\ \mathcal{F}(\tilde{M}),$$

and the Theorem is proved. □

3.24 Theorem. *Let K be a compact convex set and let μ be a maximal Radon probability measure on K. Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be the measure induced on $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;C)$ and let $\varphi: ex\ K\to\mathbb{R}_+$ be a $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K;C)$-measurable function such that $\tilde{\mu}(\varphi)=1$. Let us define*

$$(*)\quad \mu_1(D)=\tilde{\mu}(\varphi x_D),\quad \forall D\in\mathcal{B}_0(K),$$

and let us also denote by μ_1 the Radon probability measure on K, determined by μ_1, as given in (*). Then

1) μ_1 is maximal on K, and

2) $\tilde{\mu}_1=\varphi\tilde{\mu}$.

Proof. a) let μ_0 be a maximal Radon probability measure on K, such that $\mu_1<\mu_0$. Then we have

$$\mu_1(F)\le\mu_0(F),\quad\forall F\in\mathcal{F}_C(K).$$

For any $D\in\mathcal{B}_0(K)$ and any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists a $D_0\in\mathcal{B}_0(K)\cap\mathcal{F}(K)$, such that $D_0\subset D$ and $\mu_0(D\backslash D_0)<\varepsilon$ (see the Corollary to Theorem 4). It follows that

$$\tilde{\mu}((D\cap(ex\ K))\backslash(D_0\cap(ex\ K)))<\varepsilon$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(D) &= \tilde{\mu}((x_D \mid (ex\ K))\varphi) \\ &= \sup\{\tilde{\mu}((x_{D_0} \mid (ex\ K))\varphi); D_0 \subset D, D_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0(K) \cap \mathcal{F}_C(K)\} \\ &= \sup\{\mu_1(D_0); D_0 \subset D, D_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0(K) \cap \mathcal{F}_C(K)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have

$$\mu_1(D_0) \leq \mu_0(D_0) \leq \mu_0(D),$$

for any $D_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0(K) \cap \mathcal{F}_C(K)$, $D_0 \subset D$, we infer that

$$\mu_1(D) \leq \mu_0(D), \quad \forall D \in \mathcal{B}_0(K).$$

This implies that $\mu_1 = \mu_0$ and, therefore, μ_1 is maximal.

b) For any compact extremal subset $F \subset K$ there exists a compact Baire measurable subset $D \subset K$, such that

$$\mu_1(F) = \mu_1(D), \mu(F) = \mu(D) \text{ and } F \subset D.$$

It follows that

$$\tilde{\mu}_1(F \cap (ex\ K)) = \mu_1(F) = \mu_1(D) = \tilde{\mu}((x_D \mid (ex\ K))\varphi) = \tilde{\mu}((x_F \mid (ex\ K))\varphi).$$

Since $\tilde{\mu}$ and $\tilde{\mu}_1$ are regular on $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K; C)$, this implies that

$$\tilde{\mu}_1 = \varphi\tilde{\mu}.$$

□

We shall denote $\mu_1 = \varphi\mu$, which makes sense, although φ is defined only on *ex K*. The following Theorem clarifies this situation.

3.25 Theorem. *Let $\varphi : ex\ K \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K; C)$-measurable function, such that*

$$\tilde{\mu}(\varphi) = 1.$$

Let $\Phi : K \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a $\mathcal{B}_1(K; C)$-measurable function, such that $\Phi \mid (ex\ K) = \varphi$. Then for any maximal Radon probability measure μ on K, we have that

$$(\Phi\mu)^{\tilde{}} = \varphi\mu.$$

Proof. For any $B \in \mathcal{B}_1(K; C)$ we have

$$(\Phi\mu)^{\tilde{}}(B \cap (exK)) = (\Phi\mu)(B) = \mu(\Phi x_B) = \tilde{\mu}((\Phi \mid ex\ K)x_{B \cap (ex\ K)}) = \tilde{\mu}(\varphi(x_B \mid (ex\ K))),$$

and the Theorem is proved. □

3.26 Theorem. *For any C-closed subset $\tilde{F} \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}$, such that*

$$(*) \quad \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}) = \tilde{\nu}(\tilde{F}),$$

if $\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}) > 0$, we have that

$$(**) \quad (\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F})^{-1} x_{\tilde{F}})\mu < (\tilde{\nu}(\tilde{F})^{-1} x_{\tilde{F}})\nu.$$

In particular, for any t-closed subset $\tilde{F} \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$, such that $\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}) > 0$, relation (**) holds.

Proof. If $\tilde{F} \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}$ is C-closed, then

$$\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F}) \cap (ex(K_0 \times K_1)) = \tilde{F},$$

where $\mathcal{F}$ is the operator defined as above, for the compact convex set $K_0 \times K_1$. Since $x_{\mathcal{F}(\hat{F})}$ is convex and upper semicontinuous on the set $K_0 \times K_1$, it follows that for any continuous convex function $f : K_0 \times K_1 \to \mathbb{R}_+$, the function

$$x_{\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F})} f : K_0 \times K_1 \to \mathbb{R}$$

is convex and upper semicontinuous. It follows that we have the inquality

$$(1) \quad \mu(X_{\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F})} f) \leq \nu(X_{\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F})} f).$$

Since we have

$$\mu(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F})) = \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F}) \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r})) = \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}) = \tilde{\nu}(\tilde{F}) = \tilde{\nu}(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F}) \cap (ex(K_0 \times K_1))) = \nu(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F})),$$

where we have taken into account the assumption (*), by adding constants we infer that inequality (1) holds for any $f \in S(K_0 \times K_1)$. Consegmently, if $\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}) > 0$, we have

$$(\mu(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F}))^{-1} x_{\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F})})\mu < (\nu(\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F}))^{-1} x_{\mathcal{F}(\tilde{F})})\nu.$$

By taking into account Theorems 33 and 34, formula (**) is established.

By Theorem 31, any τ-closed subset $\tilde{F}$ of $\subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$ is a C-closed subset for which assumption (*) holds. The Theorem is proved. $\square$

3.27 Remark. The assumption $\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{F}) > 0$ was used only in order to normalize the measures. The above proof shows that inequality (1) holds for any t-closed subset $\tilde{F} \subset \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$ and any $f \in S(K_0 \times K_1)$. This remark will be used below.

3.28 Theorem. *Let* $\varphi : \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C \to \mathbb{R}_+$ *be any* $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau)$*-measurable function, such that* $\hat{\mu}(\varphi) = 1$. *Then*

a) $\hat{\nu}(\varphi) = 1$, *and*

b) $\varphi\mu < \varphi\nu$.

Proof. a) Given a natural number $n \geq 1$, there exists a sequence of subsets $\tilde{B}_k \in \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau)$, $k \geq 0$, such that

$$\text{i)} \quad \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{B}_k = \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tilde{B}_k \cap \tilde{B}_l = \emptyset, \text{ for } k \neq l,$$

and

$$\text{ii)} \quad \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{k}{n} X_{\tilde{B}_k} - \varphi \right| \leq \frac{1}{n}, \text{ on } \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C,$$

where

$$\tilde{B}_k = \left\{ x \in \overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \frac{k}{n} \leq \varphi(x) < \frac{k+1}{n} \right\}.$$

It follows that

$$\left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{k}{n} \hat{\mu}(\hat{B}_k) - 1 \right| \leq \frac{1}{n}$$

and

$$\left|\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}\hat{\nu}(\hat{B}_k)-\hat{\nu}(\varphi)\right|\le\frac{1}{n}.$$

This immediately proves the equality in a), if we take into account also Theorem 31.

b) For any $k\ge 0$, there exists a τ-closed subset $\tilde{F}_k\subset\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$, such that $\tilde{F}_k\subset\tilde{B}_k$ and $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{B}_k\backslash\tilde{F}_k)<\frac{1}{2^k}$.

It follows that for any $f\in S(K_0\times K_1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\varphi\mu)(f)=\tilde{\mu}(\varphi f)=\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{\mu})(\varphi f)\quad&=\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})((\varphi-\textstyle\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}x_{\tilde{B}_k})f)\\&+\textstyle\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})((x_{\tilde{B}_k}-x_{\tilde{F}_k})f)+\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(x_{\tilde{F}_k}f)\\&\le\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})((\varphi-\textstyle\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}x_{\tilde{B}_k})f)+\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})((x_{\tilde{B}_k}-x_{\tilde{F}_k})f)\\&+\textstyle\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}\tilde{\nu}(x_{\tilde{F}_k}f)=\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})((\varphi-\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}x_{\tilde{B}_k})f\\&+\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})((x_{\tilde{B}_k}-x_{\tilde{F}_k})f)-\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}\tilde{\nu}((x_{\tilde{B}_k}-x_{\tilde{F}_k})f)\\&+\tilde{\nu}((\textstyle\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{k}{n}x_{\tilde{B}_k}-\varphi)f)+\tilde{\nu}(\varphi f)\\&\le\tfrac{k}{n}\left\|f\right\|_{\infty}+\tilde{\nu}(\varphi f),\quad\forall n\ge 1.\end{aligned}$$

This immediately implies that

$$\tilde{\mu}(\varphi f)\le\tilde{\nu}(\varphi f),\ \forall f\in S(K_0\times K_1),$$

and, therefore, $\varphi\mu<\varphi\nu$. The Theorem is proved. □

3.29 Theorem. *Let* $\varphi\in\mathcal{L}^1(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C,\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C;\tau),\hat{\mu})$. *Then* $\varphi\mid\Gamma(\tilde{r})\in\mathcal{L}^1(\Gamma(\tilde{r}),\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C;C),\tilde{\mu})$ *and*

$$\int_{\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}}\varphi d\hat{\mu}=\int_{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}(\varphi\mid\Gamma(\tilde{r}))d\tilde{\mu}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 30 we have that

$$\tilde{B}\in\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C;\tau)\Rightarrow\tilde{B}\cap\Gamma(\tilde{r})\in\mathcal{B}(\Gamma(\tilde{r});C).$$

We also have that

$$\hat{\mu}(\tilde{B})=\tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\tilde{B})=\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{B}\cap\Gamma(\tilde{r})),\quad\tilde{B}\in\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C;\tau).$$

The Theorem now follows immediately. □

Section 8

Let us now define the mapping

$$E:L^{\hat{}}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C;\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C;C),\tilde{\nu})\to L^{\hat{}}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C;\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C;\tau)\hat{\nu})$$

to be the conditional expectation on $(\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C;C)\tilde{\nu})$, given $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C;\tau)$.

3.30 Theorem. *We have that*

$$E(h) = h,\ \tilde{\mu} - a.e.\ on\ \Gamma(\tilde{r}),$$

for any $h \in A(K_0 \times K_1)$*.*

Proof. By Theorem 36, for any

$$\varphi \in \mathcal{L}^1(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C, \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau), \hat{\mu}),\ \varphi \geq 0,$$

such that $\hat{\mu}(\varphi)(= \hat{\nu}(\varphi)) = 1$, we have $\varphi\mu < \varphi\nu$, and this implies that $\varphi\mu\tilde{}\varphi\nu$. It follows that we have

$$\tilde{\mu}(\varphi h) = \tilde{\rho}_*(\tilde{\mu})(\varphi h) = \tilde{\nu}(\varphi h) = \hat{\nu}(E(\varphi h)) = \tilde{\nu}(\varphi E(h)) = \hat{\mu}(\varphi E(h)) = \tilde{\mu}((\varphi \mid \Gamma(\tilde{r}))(E(h) \mid (\Gamma(\tilde{r}))),$$

for any $h \in A(K_0 \times K_1)$. We infer that

$$E(h) = h,\ \tilde{\mu} - a.e. \text{ on } \Gamma(\tilde{r}),$$

and the Theorem is proved. □

We can prove now the following result:

3.31 Theorem. *The measure* $\rho_*(\mu)$ *is maximal on* $K_0 \times K_1$*.*

Proof. a) We shall prove that $\rho_*(\mu) = \nu$, and the proof will be carried out with the help of the Cartier-Fell-Meyer Theorem. Namely, we shall prove that

$$\nu < \rho_*(\mu)$$

and this will imply that $\rho_*(\mu) = \nu$ by the antisymmetry of the Choquet order relation.

Let $\nu = \nu_1 + \nu_2 + ... + \nu_n$ be any decomposition of ν as a sum of positive Radon measures ν_k, $1 \leq k \leq n$. Then ν_k, suitably normed, is maximal on $K_0 \times K_1$ and for the corresponding measures $\tilde{\nu}_k$, induced on $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex(K_0 \times K_1); C)$, we have

$$\tilde{\nu} = \tilde{\nu}_1 + \tilde{\nu}_2 + ... + \tilde{\nu}_n.$$

Of course, all the measures $\tilde{\nu}_k$ are $\tilde{\nu}$-absolutely continuous and, therefore, they are concentrated on $\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C$.

b) Let us define

$$\hat{\nu}_k = \tilde{\nu}_k \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}; \tau),\ 1 \leq k \leq n,$$

and also define the measures $\tilde{\mu}_k$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, by the formula

$$\tilde{\mu}_k(\tilde{B} \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r})) = \hat{\nu}_k(\tilde{B}), \tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^C; \tau).$$

The definition is correct, because the equality

$$\tilde{B}_1 \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r}) = \tilde{B}_2 \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r}),$$

for $\tilde{B}_1, \tilde{B}_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}; \tau)$, implies

$$(\tilde{B}_1 \triangle \tilde{B}_2) \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r}) = \emptyset$$

and, therefore,

$$0 = \tilde{\mu}((\tilde{B}_1 \Delta \tilde{B}_2) \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r})) = \hat{\mu}(\tilde{B}_1 \Delta \tilde{B}_2) = \hat{\nu}(\tilde{B}_1 \Delta \tilde{B}_2) = \tilde{\nu}(\tilde{B}_1 \Delta \tilde{B}_2).$$

It follows that

$$\hat{\nu}_k(\tilde{B}_1 \Delta \tilde{B}_2) = 0$$

and this implies that

$$\hat{\nu}_k(\tilde{B}_1) = \hat{\nu}_k(\tilde{B}_2),\ 1 \le k \le n.$$

c) For any $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\overline{\Gamma(\tilde{r})}^{C}; \tau)$ we have that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \tilde{\mu}_k(\tilde{B} \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r})) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \hat{\nu}_k(\tilde{B}) = \hat{\nu}(\tilde{B}) = \hat{\mu}(\tilde{B}) = \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{B} \cap \Gamma(\tilde{r})),$$

and this shows that

$$(1) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{n} \tilde{\mu}_k = \tilde{\mu}.$$

It follows that the measures $\tilde{\mu}_k$, $1 \le k \le n$, which are defined on $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma(\tilde{r}); C)$, are regular and, moreover,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(\Gamma(\tilde{r})) \subset \mathcal{B}(\Gamma(\tilde{r}); C)(\tilde{\mu}_k),\ 1 \le k \le n.$$

The completion of $\tilde{\mu}_k$ then extends it to $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(\Gamma(\tilde{r}))$ and, with Theorem 11, we have maximal measures μ_k on $\Gamma(r)$, which induce the measures $\tilde{\mu}_k$ on $\Gamma(\tilde{r})$, $1 \le k \le n$. From (1) we infer that

$$\mu = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mu_k.$$

d) For any $h \in A(K_0 \times K_1)$ and any k, $1 \le k \le n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_*(\mu_k)(h) &= \mu_k(h \mid \Gamma(r)) = \tilde{\mu}_k(h \mid \Gamma(\tilde{r})) = \tilde{\mu}_k(E(h) \mid \Gamma(\tilde{r})) \\ &= \hat{\nu}_k(E(h)) = \hat{\nu}_k(h) = \nu_k(h), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Theorem 38.

This shows that $\rho_*(\mu_k)\tilde{}\nu_k$, $1 \le k \le n$. The Cartier-Fell-Meyer Theorem now implies that $\nu < \rho_*(\mu)$, and the Theorem is proved. □

We can prove now the main result of the paper.

3.32 Theorem. *Let $r : K_0 \to K_1$ be a continuous affine mapping. Then the following are equivalent:*

a) r is admissible; i.e., $r(ex\ K_0) \subset ex\ K_1$;

b) for any maximal Radon probability measure μ_0 on K_0 the direct image $r_*(\mu_0)$ is maximal on K_1.

Proof. a)⇒b). Indeed, if μ_0 is maximal on K_0, then $\mu = R_*(\mu_0)$ is maximal on $\Gamma(r)$. By Theorem 39 it follows that $\rho_*(\mu)$ is maximal on $K_0 \times K_1$. Theorem 28 now implies that the measure

$$r_*(\mu_0) = (p_1)_*(\rho_*(\mu))$$

is maximal on K_1.

b)⇒a). Indeed, if $x_0 \in ex\ K_0$, then the Dirac measure ε_{x_0} at x_0 is maximal on K_0. It follows that $r_*(\varepsilon_{x_0}) = \varepsilon_{r(x_0)}$ is maximal on K_1 and, by Bauer's Theorem, this implies that $r(x_0) \in ex\ K_1$. □

3.33 Remark. 1) A particular case of Theorem 40, when K_0 and K_1 are compact Choquet simplices, is established in ([27], Lemma, p. 87).

2) The problem of establishing Theorem 40 in the general case is formulated implicitly in ([5], p. 108).

Section 9

As an application, we obtain the following theorem.

3.34 Theorem. *Let $r : K_0 \to K_1$ be an admissible continuous affine mapping. Then the mapping $\tilde{r} : ex\ K_0 \to K_1$ is continuous if the spaces $ex\ K_0$ and $ex\ K_1$ are endowed with their maximal topologies.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{M} \subset ex\ K_1$ be any M-closed subset. Then there exists an M-extremal compact subset $M \subset K_1$, such that

$$M \cap (ex\ K_1) = \overline{M}$$

(one can take $M = \overline{\tilde{M}}^{\sigma}$; i.e., the closure in K_1 with respect to the original topology).

a) The set $r^{-1}(M)$ is obviously compact and also M-extremal. Indeed, if μ_0 is any maximal Radon probability measure on K_0, such that

$$b(\mu_0) \in r^{-1}(M),$$

then

$$b(r_*(\mu_0)) = r(b(\mu_0)) \in M,$$

and, since $r_*(\mu_0)$ is maximal on K_1, it follows that

$$1 = r_*(\mu_0)(M) = \mu_0(r^{-1}(M)).$$

This proves that $r^{-1}(M)$ is M-extremal.

b) Let us now remark that

$$\tilde{r}^{-1}(\tilde{M}) = r^{-1}(M) \cap (ex\ K_0).$$

This shows that $\tilde{r}^{-1}(\tilde{M})$ is M-closed in $ex\ K_0$, and the Theorem is proved. $\square$

3.35 Theorem. *Let $C \subset K$ be an admissible compact convex subset of the compact convex set K. Then, for any maximal Radon probability measure μ on K we have*

$$\mu(C) = \tilde{\mu}^*(C \cap (ex\ K)).$$

Proof. There exists a compact Baire measureable set $D \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$, such that $C \subset D$ and $\mu(C) = \mu(D)$.

It follows that

$$C \cap (ex\ K) \subset D \cap (ex\ K),$$

and, therefore,

$$(1)\quad \tilde{\mu}^*(C \cap (ex\ K)) \leq \tilde{\mu}(D \cap (ex\ K)) = \mu(D) = \mu(C).$$

Let now $\tilde{F} \subset ex\ K$ be any C-closed subset of $ex\ K$, such that

$$(2)\quad \tilde{F} \cap C = \emptyset.$$

Then there exists a compact extremal subset $F \subset K$, such that $\tilde{F} = F \cap (ex\ K)$. It follows that $F \cap C = \emptyset$. Indeed, $F \cap C$ is a compact extremal subset of C; if $F \cap C \neq \emptyset$, it follows that $\emptyset \neq ex(F \cap C) = F \cap (exC) = F \cap C \cap (ex\ K) = C \cap \tilde{F}$, in contradiction to (2).

We infer that $\mu(C)+\mu(F)\le 1$ and, therefore,

$$\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{F})=\mu(F)\le 1-\mu(C).$$

We infer that

$$1-\tilde{\mu}^*(C\cap(ex\ K))=\tilde{\mu}_*((ex\ K)\backslash C)\le 1-\mu(C)$$

and this shows that

$$(3)\quad \mu(C)\le\tilde{\mu}^*(C\cap(ex\ K)).$$

From (1) and (3) we infer the required result. □

3.36 Theorem. *Let $r:K_0\to K_1$ be an admissible continuous affine mapping and let $C\subset K_0$ be an admissible compact convex subset of K_0. Then $r(C)$ is an admissible compact convex subset of K_1.*

Proof. Let $x_1\in ex\ r(C)$. Then there exists an $x_0\in ex\ C$, such that $x_1=r(x_0)$. It follows that $x_0\in ex\ K_0$ and, therefore, $x_1\in ex\ K_1$. □

3.37 Theorem. *a) For any compact extremal subset $F\subset K_0$, the compact convex subset $\overline{co}(F)$ is admissible.*

b) For any admissible continuous affine mapping $r:K_0\to K_1$, any compact extremal subset $F\subset K_0$ and any maximal Radon probability measure μ_1 on K_1, we have the following:

i) $\overline{co}(r(F))\cap(ex\ K_1)=r(F)\cap(ex\ K_1)=r(F\cap(ex\ K_0))$.

ii) $\overline{co}(r(F))$ is an admissible compact convex subset of K_1.

iii) $\mu_1(r(F))=\mu_1(\overline{co}(r(F)))=\tilde{\mu}_1^*(r(F)\cap(ex\ K_1))$.

Proof. a) If $x_0\in ex\ \overline{co}(F)$, then $x_0\in F$, by the Milman Converse Theorem. If $x_0\notin ex\ K_0$, then $x_0=tx_1+(1-t)x_2$, with $0<t<1$ and $x_1\neq x_0\neq x_2$. It follows that x_1, $x_2\in F$, because F is extremal and, therefore, $x_1,x_2\in\overline{co}(F)$, a contradiction.

b) i) Let $x_1\in\overline{co}(r(F))\cap(ex\ K_1)=ex\ \overline{co}(r(F))$; then there exists an $x_0\in ex\,\overline{co}(F)$, such that $r(x_0)=x_1$. It follows that $x_0\in F$, and, therefore, $x_1\in r(F)$.

If $x_1\in r(F)\cap(ex\ K_1)$, then $x_1\in ex\ \overline{co}(r(F))$, and, therefore, there is an $x_0\in ex\ \overline{co}(F)$, such that $r(x_0)=x_1$. It follows that $x_0\in F\cap(ex\ K_0)$ and, therefore, $x_1\in r(F\cap(ex\ K_0))$.

ii) Since $\overline{co}(r(F))=r(\overline{co}(F))$, the statement follows from part a) and Theorem 43.

iii) By parts i), ii) and Theorem 42, we have that

$$\mu_1(\overline{co}(r(F)))=\tilde{\mu}_1^*(r(F)\cap(ex\ K_1)).$$

Since $r(F)$ is compact, there is a Baire measurable set $D\in\mathcal{B}_0(K_1)$, such that $r(F)\subset D$ and $\mu_1(r(F))=\mu_1(D)$. It follows that

$$r(F)\cap(ex\ K_1)\subset D\cap(ex\ K_1),$$

and

$$(1)\quad \tilde{\mu}_1^*(r(F)\cap(ex\ K_1))\le\tilde{\mu}_1(D\cap(ex\ K_1))=\mu\,(D)=\mu(rF))\,.$$

Since $r(F)\subset\overline{co}(r(F))$, we infer that

$$\mu_1(r(F))\le\mu_1(\overline{co}(r(F)))$$

and we have

$$\mu_1(\overline{co}(r(F))) = \tilde{\mu}_1^*(\overline{co}(r(F)) \cap (ex\ K_1))$$

by Theorem 42 and

$$\overline{co}(r(F)) \cap (ex\ K_1) = r(F) \cap (ex\ K_0),$$

by part i). It follows that

$$(2)\ \ \mu_1(r(F)) \leq \tilde{\mu}_1^*(r(F) \cap (ex\ K_0)).$$

From (1) and (2) the desired result follows. The Theorem is proved. □

Theorem 43 shows, in particular, that the image of a face of a compact convex set by an admissible continuous affine mapping into another compact convex set is an admissible compact convex subset. In the next section we shall prove that any admissible compact convex subset can be obtained in this manner.

4 Admissible concave upper semicontinuous functions

In this section we shall study the *admissible* concave upper semicontinuous functions $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$, which we shall define below, and we shall show that they have good integration properties with respect to the boundary measures. As above, here K will be any compact convex subset of a Hausdorff locally convex topological real vector space E.

Section 1

For any concave upper semicontinuous function $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ we shall consider its graph $\Gamma(\varphi)$, defined by

$$\Gamma(\varphi) = \{(x, \varphi(x); x \in K\} \subset K \times \mathbb{R},$$

and its subgraph $s(\varphi)$, defined by

$$s(\varphi) = \{(x,t); x \in k; 0 \leq t \leq \varphi(x)\}.$$

Of course, $s(\varphi)$ is a compact convex subset of $E \times \mathbb{R}$.

We define the projections $p : s(\varphi) \to K$ and $\varsigma : s(\varphi) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$p(x,t) = x, \quad (x,t) \in s(\varphi),$$

$$\varsigma(x,t) = t, \quad (x,t) \in s(\varphi).$$

They are continuous affine mappings and $\varsigma \in A(s(\varphi))$.

4.1 Theorem. *a) The graph $\Gamma(\varphi)$ of φ is an extremal G_Γ-subset of the subgraph $s(\varphi)$.*

b) For any Radon probablility measure μ on K there exists a Radon probability measure ν on $s(\varphi)$, such that

$$p_*(\nu) = \mu \text{ and } \nu(\Gamma(\varphi)) = 1.$$

Moreover, such a ν is unique and it is a stable lifting of μ.

Proof. a) Let us consider the sets

$$\Gamma_n = \left\{ (x,t) \in s(\varphi); \varphi(x) - \frac{1}{n} < t \leq \varphi(x) \right\},$$

for $n \geq 1$. From the upper semicontinuity of φ it immediately follows that Γ_n is open in $s(\varphi)$, for any $n \geq 1$, and we have

$$\Gamma(\varphi) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \Gamma_n.$$

Let us now prove that $\Gamma(\varphi)$ is an extremal subset of $s(\varphi)$. Indeed, let $(x_0, \varphi(x_0)) \in \Gamma(\varphi)$ and assume that

$$(x_0, \varphi(x_0)) = t(x_1, t_1) + (1-t)(x_2, t_2),$$

with $0 < t < 1$, $0 \leq t_1 \leq \varphi(x_1)$, $0 \leq t_2 \leq \varphi(x_2)$. Then $x_0 = tx_1 + (1-t)x_2$ and

$$\varphi(x_0) = tt_1 + (1-t)t_2 \leq t\varphi(x_1) + (1-t)\varphi(x_2).$$

Since φ is concave, we have

$$\varphi(x_0) \geq t\varphi(x_1) + (1-t)\varphi(x_2).$$

We immediately infer that $t_1 = \varphi(x_1)$, $t_2 = \varphi(x_2)$.

b) Let μ be any Radon probability measure on K. Since φ is Borel measurable, by the Theorem of Lusin, we can find a sequence $(F_k)_{k \geq 0}$ of mutually disjoint compact subsets of K, such that $\mu \left(\bigcup\limits_{k=0}^{\infty} F_k = 1 \right)$ and $\varphi \mid F_k$ is continuous, for any $k \geq 0$. Let us define $\Phi : K \to s(\varphi)$ by

$$\Phi(x) = (x, \varphi(x)), \quad x \in K.$$

Then $\Phi \mid F_k$ is continuous, for any $k \geq 0$. Define $\nu_k = \Phi_k(x_{F_k}\mu)$, $k \geq 0$, and

$$\nu = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \nu_k$$

(convergence in norm). Then ν is a Radon probability measure on $s(\varphi)$ and $\nu(\Gamma(\varphi)) = 1$.

c) For any compact subset $M \subset \Gamma(\varphi)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(M) &= \nu(p^{-1}(p(M)) \cap \Gamma(\varphi)) = \nu(p^{-1}(p(M))) \\ &= p_*(\nu)(p(M)) = \mu(p(M)), \end{aligned}$$

and this establishes the uniqueness of ν. Let us prove now that $\nu \in ex\ p_*^{-1}(\{\mu\})$. Indeed, if $\nu = \lambda\nu_1 = (1-\lambda)\nu_2$, where $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $\nu_1, v_2 \in p_*^{-1}(\{\mu\})$, we infer that

$$1 = \nu(\Gamma(\varphi)) = \lambda\nu_1(\Gamma(\varphi)) + (1-\lambda)\nu_2(\Gamma(\varphi)),$$

and this implies that $\nu_1(\Gamma(\varphi)) = \nu_2(\Gamma(\varphi)) = 1$. Since we have that $p_*(\nu_1) = p_*(\nu_2) = \mu$, the uniqueness property now implies that $\nu_1 = \nu = \nu_2$. It follows that ν is a stable lifting of μ, by taking into account ([26], Theorem 12). The Theorem is proved. □

4.2 Theorem. *With the above notation, we have*

a) $ex\ s(\varphi) \subset [(exK) \times \{0\}] \cup \Gamma(\varphi)$ *and*

b) $[(ex\ K) \times \{0\}] \cup \left[p^{-1}(ex\ K) \cap \Gamma(\varphi)\right] \subset ex\ s(\varphi)$.

Proof. a) Let $(x,t) \in ex\ s(\varphi)$ and assume that $(x,t) \notin \Gamma(\varphi)$. Then $0 \leq t < \varphi(x)$. If $0 < t$, then $t = \frac{1}{2}(t_1 + t_2)$, where $0 \leq t_1 \subset t \subset t_2 \leq \varphi(x)$. It follows that

$$(x,t) = \frac{1}{2}\left[(x,t_1) + (x,t_2)\right],$$

where

$$(x,t_1)\,,(x,t_2) \in s(\varphi),$$

and

$$(x,t_1) \neq (x,t) \neq (x,t_2)\,;$$

hence, $(x,t) \notin ex\ s(\varphi)$, contrary to the assumption. It follows that $t = 0$. If $x \notin ex\ K$, then $x = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$, with $x_1, x_2 \in K$ and $x_1 \neq x \neq x_2$. It follows that

$$(x,0) = \frac{1}{2}\left[(x_1,0) + (x_2,0)\right]$$

and

$$(x_1,0) \neq (x,0) \neq (x_2,0); (x_1,0)(x_2,0) \in s(\varphi).$$

This shows that $(x,0) \notin ex\ s(\varphi)$, contrary to the assumption; hence, $x \in ex\ K$.

b) Let $x \in ex\ K$; then $(x,0) \in s(\varphi)$. Assume that

$$(x,0) = \frac{1}{2}\left[(x_1,t_1) + (x_2,t_2)\right],$$

where $x_1, x_2 \in K$ and $0 \leq t_1 \leq \varphi(x_1)$, $0 \leq t_2 \leq \varphi(x_2)$. It follows that $x = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$, and this implies that $x_1 = x = x_2$; also, we have that $0 = \frac{1}{2}(t_1 + t_2)$, and, therefore, $t_1 = 0 = t_2$. This proves that $(x,0) \in ex\ s(\varphi)$. Let now $(x,\varphi(x)) \in p^{-1}(ex\ K)$. Then $x \in ex\ K$. Assume that

$$(x,\varphi(x)) = \frac{1}{2}\left[(x_1,t_1) + (x_2,t_2)\right],$$

where $x_1, x_2 \in K$, and $0 \leq t_1 \leq \varphi(x_1), 0 \leq t_2 \leq \varphi(x_2)$. It follows that $x = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$ and

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2}(t_1 + t_2).$$

We infer that $x_1 = x = x_2$ and, therefore,

$$t_1 = \varphi(x) = t_2.$$

This shows that $(x,\varphi(x)) \in ex\ s(\varphi)$. The Theorem is proved. $\square$

4.3 Theorem. *Let $D \subset K$ be any compact subset. Then for the upper semicontinuous concave hull $\hat{x}_D$ of x_D we have that*

$$s(\hat{x}_D) = co\left((K \times \{0\}) \cup (\overline{co}(D) \times \{1\}\right).$$

Proof. Since $K \times \{0\}$ and $\overline{co}(D) \times \{1\}$ are compact convex subsets of $s\,(\hat{x}_D)$, the set

$$S = co\,((K \times \{0\}) \cup (\overline{co}(D) \times \{1\}))$$

is a compact convex subset of $s(\hat{x}_D)$. Let us assume that there exists a point $(x_0, t_0) \in s(\hat{x}_D)$, such that $(x_0, t_0) \notin S$. Then there exists a continuous linear functional $L : E \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$L\,(x,t) \leq \alpha \subset L(x_0, t_0), \quad \forall (x,t) \in S.$$

Since L has the form

$$L(x,t) = l(x) + kt,$$

where $l : E \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous linear functional on E and $k \in \mathbb{R}$, we infer that

$$(1) \quad l(x) \leq \alpha \subset (x_0) + kt_0, \;\; \forall x \in K,$$

and

$$(2) \quad l(x) = k \leq \alpha \subset l(x_0) + kt_0, \;\; \forall x \in \overline{co}(D).$$

From (1) we get that

$$l(x_0) \leq \alpha \subset l(x_0) + kt_0,$$

and this implies that $k > 0$. It follows that the continuous affine function

$$h = \frac{1}{k}(\alpha - l)$$

satisfies

$$(1') \;\; 0 \leq h(x), \;\; x \in K,$$

and

$$(2') \;\; 1 \leq h(x), \;\; x \in \overline{co}(D).$$

This shows that $x_D \leq h$ on K, and, therefore $\hat{x}_D \leq h$. It follows that

$$t_0 \leq \hat{x}_D(x_0) \leq h(x_0),$$

which implies that

$$l(x_0) + kt_0 \leq \alpha,$$

and this is a contradiction. The Theorem is proved. □

4.4 Corollary. *For any compact subset $D \subset K$, we have that $\hat{x}_D = \hat{x}_{\overline{co}(D)}$.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 47. □

4.5 Theorem. *With the above notations we have that*

$$\hat{x}_D(x) = 1 \Leftrightarrow x \in \overline{co}(D).$$

Proof. If $x_0 \in \overline{co}(D)$, then $(x_0, 1) \in s(\hat{x}_D)$ and this shows that $1 \leq \hat{x}_D(x_0) \leq 1$. Assume now that $\hat{x}_D(x_0) = 1$. By the preceding Theorem we have

$$(x_0, 1) = \lambda(x_0', 1) + (1 - \lambda)(x_0'', 0),$$

where $\lambda \in [0,1]$ and $x_0' \in \overline{co}(D)$. It follows that $\lambda = 1$ and $x_0 = x_0' \in \overline{co}(D)$. □

Section 2

For any upper semicontinuous concave function $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$, we shall denote

$$L_0 = K \times \{0\} \subset s(\varphi);$$

it is obvious that L_0 is a compact face of $s(\varphi)$.

4.6 Lemma. *For any $(x,t) \in s(\varphi)$ we have that*

$$\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) = 1 \Leftrightarrow t = 0.$$

Proof. By Theorem 47, we have $\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) = 1$ if, and only if, $(x,t) \in \overline{co}(L_0) = L_0$. $\square$

4.7 Theorem. *Let $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ be an upper semicontinuous concave function, such that $\varphi(x) > 0$, for any $x \in ex\ K$. Then, for any $(x,t) \in s(\varphi)$, we have that*

$$\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) = 0 \Leftrightarrow t = \varphi(x).$$

Proof. By the Strict Minimum Principle (see [10]), we have

$$\varphi(x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in K.$$

a) Assume that $\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) = 0$, then $t > 0$. It follows that we have

$$0 < t \leq \varphi(x),$$

and this implies that

$$(x,t) = (1 - \frac{1}{\varphi(x)})(x,0) + \frac{t}{\varphi(x)}(x,\varphi(x)).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) \geq (1 - \frac{t}{\varphi(x)})\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,0) + \frac{t}{\varphi(x)}\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,\varphi(x)) \\ &= 1 - \frac{t}{\varphi(x)} + \frac{t}{\varphi(x)}\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,\varphi(x)), \end{aligned}$$

and this gives

$$t = \varphi(x).$$

b) Assume now that $t = \varphi(x)$. Since $\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) = 1$ implies $t = 0$, we infer that $\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,\varphi(x)) < 1$. By Theorem 47, we have that

$$((x,\varphi(x)), \hat{x}_{L_0}(x,\varphi(x))) = \lambda((x_1,0),1) + (1-\lambda)((x_0,t_0),0),$$

where $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ and $x_0, x_1 \in K, 0 \leq t_0 \leq \varphi(x_0)$.

It follows that

i) $\lambda = \hat{x}_{L_0}(x,\varphi(x))$,

ii) $x = \lambda x_1 + (1-\lambda)x_0$,

iii) $\varphi(x) = (1-\lambda)t_0$.

By the concavity of φ, we infer that

$$\varphi(x) \geq \lambda\varphi(x_1) + (1-\lambda)\varphi(x_0)$$

and, therefore, from iii), we obtain that

$$(1-\lambda)t_0 \geq \lambda\varphi(x_1) + (1-\lambda)\varphi(x_0).$$

It follows that

$$0 \geq \lambda\varphi(x_1) + (1-\lambda)(\varphi(x_0) - t_0),$$

and this implies that

$$\lambda\varphi(x_1) = 0.$$

It follows that $\lambda = 0$. $\square$

4.8 Corollary. *Let $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ be any upper semicontinuous concave function, such that $\varphi(x) > 0$, for any $x \in ex\ K$. Then*

a) $s(x_{L_0}) \overset{def}{=} \{(x,t) \in s(\varphi); \hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) = x_{L_0}(x,t)\} = L_0 \cup \Gamma(\varphi)$.

b) For any maximal Radon probability measure ν on $s(\varphi)$ we have that

$$\nu(L_0) + \nu(\Gamma(\varphi)) = 1.$$

Proof. As above, by the Strict Minimum Principle, we have $\varphi(x) > 0$, for any $x \in K$. It follows that $L_0 \cap \Gamma(\varphi) = \emptyset$. Statement a) now follows immediately from Theorem 49.

b) Since ν is maximal, we have $\nu(s(x_{L_0})) = 1$. It follows that $\nu(L_0) + \nu(\Gamma(\varphi)) = 1$. $\square$

4.9 Theorem. *Let $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ be any upper semicontinuous concave function and let ν be any Radon probability measure on $s(\varphi)$. Then we have the following*

a) $\nu(\varsigma) \leq p_*(\nu)(\varphi)$;

b) $\nu(\varsigma) = p_*(\nu)(\varphi)$ if, and only if, $\nu(\Gamma(\varphi)) = 1$.

Proof. Let us consider the upper semicontinuous concave function $\Phi : s(\varphi) \to [0,1]$, given by

$$\Phi(x,t) = \varphi(x) - t, \quad (x,t) \in s(\varphi);$$

i.e., $\Phi = \varphi \circ p - \varsigma$. We have that

$$0 \leq \nu(\Phi) = \nu(\varphi \circ p) - \nu(\varsigma) = p_*(\nu)(\varphi) - \nu(\varsigma),$$

and this proves a). It follows that the equality in a) holds if, and only if, $\nu(\Phi) = 0$, and this is equivalent to the equality $\nu(\Gamma(\varphi)) = 1$. $\square$

4.10 Theorem. *Let $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ be any upper semicontinuous concave function and let μ be any Radon probability measure on K. Then we have the following statements:*

a) For any Radon probability measure ν on $s(\varphi)$, such that $p_*(\nu) = \mu$, we have that $\nu(\varsigma) \leq \mu(\varphi)$.

b) There exists a Radon probability measure ν on $s(\varphi)$, such that $p_*(\nu) = \mu$ and $\nu(\varsigma) = \mu(\varphi)$. Moreover, the measure ν satisfying these conditions is unique.

c) If the measure μ is maximal on K, then the unique measure ν, determined in b), is maximal on $s(\varphi)$.

Proof. a) This follows immediately from Theorem 50, a).

b) By Theorem 45, b), there exists a unique Radon probability measure ν on $s(\varphi)$, such that $\nu(\Gamma(\varphi)) = 1$ and $p_*(\nu) = \mu$. Theorem 50, b) gives now the desired result.

c) Let ν be the Radon probability measure on $s(\varphi)$, determined as in b). Let ν_1 be a maximal Radon probability measure on $s(\varphi)$, such that $\nu < \nu_1$. Then we have that

$$0 \leq \nu_1(\Phi) \leq \nu(\Phi) = 0 \text{ and } \mu = p_*(\nu) < p_*(\nu_1).$$

It follows that

$$\nu_1(\Gamma(\varphi)) = 1 \text{ and } p_*(\nu_1) = \mu,$$

and this implies that $\nu = \nu_1$. □

4.11 Lemma. *Let $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ be any upper semicontinuous concave function. Then we have that*

$$s(x_{L_0}) \subset L_0 \cup \Gamma(\varphi).$$

Proof. Assume that $\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) = x_{L_0}(x,t)$. Then we have either

a) $\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) = x_{L_0}(x,t) = 1$, or

b) $\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) = x_{L_0}(x,t) = 0$.

In case a) we infer that $t = 0$ and, therefore, $(x,t) \in L_0$.

In case b), we have $0 < t \leq \varphi(x)$ and, therefore,

$$(x,t) = (1 - \frac{t}{\varphi(x)}(x,0) + \frac{t}{\varphi(x)}(x,\varphi(x)).$$

We infer that

$$0 = \hat{x}_{L_0}(x,t) \geq (1 - \frac{t}{\varphi(x)})\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,0) + \frac{t}{\varphi(x)}\hat{x}_{L_0}(x,\varphi(x)) \geq 1 - \frac{t}{\varphi(x)}.$$

It follows that

$$t = \varphi(x)$$

and this shows that $(x,t) \in \Gamma(\varphi)$. □

4.12 Corollary. *Let $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ be any upper semicontinuous concave function and let ν be any maximal Radon probability measure on $s(\varphi)$. Then $\nu(L_0 \cup \Gamma(\varphi)) = 1$.*

Proof. By Mokobodski's Theorem, we have that $\nu(s(x_{L_0})) = 1$. □

Section 3

An upper semicontinuous concave function $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ will be said to be *admissible* if the continuous affine mapping

$$p : s(\varphi) \to K$$

is admissible. Of course, this is equivalent to the condition that

$$p(ex\ s(\varphi)) = ex\ K.$$

4.13 Theorem. *An upper semicontinuous concave function $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ is admissible if, and only if,*

$$ex\ s(\varphi) = [(ex\ K) \times \{0\}] \cup \left[p^{-1}(ex\ K) \cap \Gamma(\varphi)\right].$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 46. □

4.14 Theorem. *An upper semicontinuous concave function* $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ *is admissible if, and only if,*

$$(*) \quad ex\ \Gamma(\varphi) \subset p^{-1}(ex\ K).$$

Proof. First, let us remark that the inclusion (*) implies the equality

$$(**) \quad ex\ \Gamma(\varphi) = \Gamma(\varphi) \cap p^{-1}(ex\ K),$$

and conversely.

i) Let us first assume that φ is admissible. Since $\Gamma(\varphi)$ is an extremal subset of $s(\varphi)$, we have

$$ex\ \Gamma(\varphi) = \Gamma(\varphi) \cap (ex\ s(\varphi)).$$

We infer that

$$(x,t) \in ex\ \Gamma(\varphi) \Rightarrow t = \varphi(x)$$

and

$$(x, \varphi(x)) \in ex\ s(\varphi).$$

By Theorem 52, we have either

a) $(x, \varphi(x)) \in (ex\ K) \times \{0\}$, or

b) $(x, \varphi(x)) \in p^{-1}(ex\ K) \cap \Gamma(\varphi)$.

In case a) we immediately infer that $(x,t) \in \Gamma(\varphi) \cap p^{-1}(ex\ K)$. In case b), we infer that $x \in ex\ K$ and

$$(x,t) = (x, \varphi(x)) \in \Gamma(\varphi) \cap p^{-1}(ex\ K).$$

ii) Conversely, assume that inclusion (*) holds. Let $(x,t) \in ex\ s(\varphi)$. By Theorem 46, a), we have either

a′) $(x,t) \in (ex\ K) \times \{0\}$, or

b′) $t = \varphi(x)$.

In case a′), we have

$$(***) \quad (x,t) \in [(ex\ K) \times \{0\}] \cup \left[p^{-1}(ex\ K) \cap \Gamma(\varphi)\right].$$

In case b′), we obtain $(x,t) \in \Gamma(\varphi)$ and, therefore, $(x,t) \in ex\ \Gamma(\varphi)$. From (*) formula (***) obtains again.

From Theorem 46 and Theorem 52 we now infer that φ is admissible. The Theorem is proved. □

4.15 Corollary. *If* $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ *is an admissible upper semicontinuous concave function, then* $p(ex\ \Gamma(\varphi)) = ex\ K$ *and* $\tilde{p} \overset{def}{=} p\,|(ex\ \Gamma(\varphi)|$ *is a C-continuous bijection between* $ex\ \Gamma(\varphi)$ *and* $ex\ K$.

We shall prove now

4.16 Theorem. *Let* $C \subset K$ *be a compact convex subset. Then the following are equivalent:*

a) C *is an admissible compact convex subset of* K.

b) $\hat{x}_C$ *is an admissible upper semicontinuous concave function on* K.

Proof. a) $\Rightarrow$ b). Let $(x,t) \in ex\ s(\hat{x}_C)$. By Theorem 46, we have either

i) $x \in ex\ K$, $t = 0$; and this implies that $p(x,t) \in ex\ K$, or

ii) $t = \hat{x}_C(x)$. In this case, by Theorem 47, we infer that

$$(x,t) = (x, \hat{x}_C)) = \lambda(x_0, 0) + (1-\lambda)(x_1, 1),$$

where $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ and $x_1 \in C$. It follows that $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = 1$. In the first case, we have $x = x_1$; therefore, we have that $x \in C$ and $\hat{x}_C(x) = 1$. It follows that $x \in ex\ C$ and this implies that $x \in ex\ K$, because C is assumed to be admissible in K. Indeed, if

$$x = tx' + (1-t)x'', x', x'' \in C, 0 < t < 1,$$

then $(x,1) \in ex\ s(\hat{x}_C)$ and

$$(x,1) = t(x',1) + (1-t)(x'',1),$$

with $(x',1), (x'',1) \in s(\hat{x}_C)$, which leads to a contradiction.

b) $\Rightarrow$ a). Indeed, if $x \in ex\ C$, then

$$(x,1) \in ex\ s(\hat{x}_C)$$

and, therefore, $x \in ex\ K$. The Theorem is proved. ☐

4.17 Corollary. *a) For any admissible compact convex subset $C \subset K$, we have that*

$$ex\ s(\hat{x}_C) = [(ex\ K) \times \{0\}] \cup \left[p^{-1}(ex\ K) \cap \Gamma(\hat{x}_C)\right].$$

b) For any compact extremal subset $F \subset K$, we have that

$$ex\ s(\hat{x}_F) = [(ex\ K) \times \{0\}] \cup \left[p^{-1}(ex\ K) \cap \Gamma(\hat{x}_F)\right].$$

Proof. a) This is an immediate consequence of Theorems 52 and 54.

b) This follows immediately from Theorem 44, a), from the Corollary to Theorem 47 and from part a). ☐

4.18 Remark. According to ([23], Corollary to Proposition 1), we have that

$$\hat{x}_M \mid ex\ K = x_M \mid ex\ K,$$

for any compact subset $M \subset K$. This allows $\Gamma(\hat{x}_C)$ and $\Gamma(\hat{x}_F)$, in the preceding formulas, to be replaced respectively by $\Gamma(x_C)$ and $\Gamma(x_F)$.

4.19 Corollary. *Any admissible compact convex subset $C \subset K$ is the image, by an admissible continuous affine mapping, of a compact face of a compact convex set.*

Proof. Consider the admissible mapping

$$p : s(\hat{x}_C) \to K$$

and the compact face $F \subset s(\hat{x}_C)$, given by

$$F = C \times \{1\}.$$

☐

Section 4

As it is well known (see [21], p.) there are examples of (non-metrizable) compact convex sets K, such that for (some) maximal Radon probability measures μ on K, we have that

$$(\mathrm{sup\,p}\ \mu) \cap (ex\ K) = \emptyset.$$

It follows that if we denote $M = \mathrm{supp}\ \mu$, we have

$$\mu(\hat{x}_M) = 1 \text{ and } \hat{x}_M \mid ex\ K = 0,$$

which shows that an equality of the form

$$\mu(\hat{x}_M) = \tilde{\mu}(\hat{x}_M),$$

using the boundary measure $\tilde{\mu}$, which corresponds to μ, is impossible. Of course, such a phenomenon is impossible if K is metrizable.

However, admissible upper semicontinuous concave functions can be integrated on the extreme boundary of K, as we shall show now.

4.20 Theorem. *Let K be any (non-empty) compact convex set and let $\varphi : K \to [0,1]$ be any admissible upper semicontinuous concave function. Let μ be any maximal Radon probability measure on K, and let $\tilde{\mu} : \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(ex\ K; C) \to [0,1]$ be the regular probability measure induced by μ on $ex\ K$. Then there exists a stable extension*

$$\tilde{\mu}_\varphi : \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_\varphi(ex\ K) \to [0,1]$$

of $\tilde{\mu}$ to a σ-algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_\varphi(ex\ K)$ of subsets of $ex\ K$, such that

a) $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K; C) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_\varphi(ex\ K)$;

b) $\varphi \mid ex\ K$ is $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_\varphi(ex\ K)$-measurable, and

c) $\int_K \varphi d\mu = \int_{ex\ K} \varphi d\tilde{\mu}_\varphi$.

Proof. Let ν be the unique maximal Radon probability measure on $s(\varphi)$, such that $p_*(\nu) = \mu$ and $\nu(\Gamma(\varphi)) = 1$ (see Theorems 45 and 51).

i) The set $\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi) \overset{def}{=} ex\ \Gamma(\varphi)$ is $\tilde{\nu}$-measurable, and $\tilde{\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)) = 1$.

Indeed, since $\Gamma(\varphi)$ is a G_j-subset of $s(\varphi)$, and since ν is maximal on $s(\varphi)$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a Baire measurable compact extremal subset $D \subset s(\varphi)$, such that

$$D \subset \Gamma(\varphi) \text{ and } 1 - \varepsilon < \nu(D)$$

(see [23], Theorem 2). It follows that

$$\tilde{D} \overset{def}{=} D \cap (ex\ s(\varphi)) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi) \text{ and } 1 - \varepsilon < \tilde{\nu}(\tilde{D});$$

of course, we have that $\tilde{D} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ s(\varphi); C)$. It follows that $\tilde{\nu}_*(\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)) = 1$, and this implies that $\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)$ is $\tilde{\nu}$-measurable and

$$\tilde{\nu}(\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)) = 1.$$

We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_K \varphi(x) d\mu(x) &= \int_K \varphi(x) dp_*(\nu)(x) = \int_{s(\varphi)} (\varphi \circ p) d\nu \\ &= \int_{\Gamma(\varphi)} (\varphi \circ p) d\nu = \int_{\Gamma(\varphi)} \varsigma d\nu = \int_{s(\varphi)} \varsigma d\nu \\ &= \int_{ex\ s(\varphi)} \varsigma d\tilde{\nu} = \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)} \varsigma d\tilde{\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider the σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of $\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)$, given by

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ B \cap \tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi); B \in \mathcal{B}_1(s(\varphi); C) \right\}.$$

Then

$$\tilde{\nu}(B \cap \tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)) = \nu(B), \;\; B \in \mathcal{B}_1(s(\varphi); C)$$

and $\varphi \circ \tilde{p}$ is $\mathcal{A}$-measurable. Let us define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_\varphi(ex\ K) = \left\{ B; B \subset ex\ K, \tilde{p}^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{A} \right\}.$$

Then $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_\varphi(ex\ K)$ is a σ-algebra of subsets of $ex\ K$, such that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K; C) \subset \tilde{B}_\varphi(ex\ K),$$

and $\tilde{\mu}_\varphi = \tilde{p}_*(\tilde{\nu} \mid \mathcal{A})$ is defined on $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_\varphi(ex\ K)$. Since we have that

$$\tilde{p}^{-1}\left(\{x \in ex\ K; \varphi(x) \leq a\}\right) = \left\{ (x,t) \in \tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi); \varsigma(x,t) \leq a \right\},$$

for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we infer that $\varphi \mid ex\ K$ is $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_\varphi(ex\ K)$-measurable. From

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_\varphi\left(\{x \in ex\ K; \varphi(x) \in a\}\right) &= \tilde{\nu}\left(\tilde{p}^{-1}\left(\{x \in ex\ K; \varphi(x) \leq a\}\right)\right) \\ &= \tilde{\nu}\left(\left\{ (x,t) \in \tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi); \varsigma(x,t) \leq a \right\}\right) \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R} \end{aligned}$$

we infer that

$$\int_{ex\ K} \varphi(x) d\mu_\varphi(x) = \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)} \varsigma(x,t) d\tilde{\nu}(x,t),$$

and this shows that

$$\int_K \varphi(x) d\mu(x) = \int_{ex\ K} \varphi(x) d\tilde{\mu}_\varphi(x).$$

ii) Let us now show that $\tilde{\mu}_\varphi$ is a stable extension of $\tilde{\mu}$. Indeed, let $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_\varphi(ex\ K)$. Then $\tilde{p}^{-1}(\tilde{B}) = B_1 \cap \tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)$, where $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1(s(\varphi); C)$. Since ν is a stable lifting of μ, there exists a $B_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0(K)$, such that

$$\nu\left(p^{-1}(B_0) \Delta B_1\right) = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \nu\left(p^{-1}(B_0)\Delta B_1\right) = \tilde{\nu}\left((p^{-1}(B_0)\Delta B_1) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)\right) \\ &= \tilde{\nu}\left(\left(p^{-1}(B_0) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)\right) \Delta \left(B_1 \cap \tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)\right)\right) \\ &= \tilde{\nu}\left(\tilde{p}^{-1}\left(B_0 \cap (ex\ K)\right) \Delta \tilde{p}^{-1}\left(\tilde{B}\right)\right) \\ &= \nu\left(\tilde{p}^{-1}\left((B_0 \cap (ex\ K)) \Delta \tilde{B}\right) = \tilde{\mu}_\varphi\left((B_0 \cap (ex\ K))\right) \Delta \tilde{B}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and $B_0 \cap (ex\ K) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1(ex\ K; C)$. The Theorem is proved. $\square$

Problem. Does a "universal" σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ exist, which includes all σ-algebras $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_\varphi(ex\ K)$ and on which all boundary measures can be extended, so that formula c) should hold?

5 Background

1. Most of the material included in sections I and II had a limited distribution as an INCREST Preprint (see [24]).
2. The material presented in sections III and IV is more recent. Theorem 55 was communicated in May 1991 at the Canadian Operator Symposium. Theorem 40 was communicated at the "Fifth Puerto Rico EPSCOR Annual Conference," in February 1993.
3. The author is now retired from the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, and can be reached at `silviu.teleman@gmail.com`. Comments and suggestions are welcome.

References

[1] E.M. Alfsen. *Compact Convex Sets and Boundary Integrals*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1971.

[2] L.Asimov, A.J. Ellis. *Convexity Theory and its Appilcations in Functional Analysis.* Academic Press, London, 1980.

[3] C.J.K. Batty. *Some properties of maximal measures on compact convex sets.* Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc., 94 (1983), p. 297-305.

[4] C.J.K. Batty. *Topologies and continuous functions on extreme points and pure states.* Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc., 98 (1985), p. 501-511.

[5] C.J. Batty. *Semi-perfect C^*-algebras and the Stone-Weierstrass problem.* J. London Math. Soc. (2), 34 (1986), p. 97-110.

[6] M. Bauer. *Kermpflichnung kompakter simplexe nit algeschlossener extremal funktmerge.* Arkiv de Mathematik, vol. XIV, fasc. 6, (1963), p. 415-421.

[7] P. Billingsley. *Probability and Measure.* John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1986.

[8] E. Bishop, K. de Leeuw. *The representation of linear functionals by measures on sets of extreme points.* Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 9 (1959), p. 305-331.

[9] N. Boboc, Gh. Bucur. *Coves convexes de fouctions continues sur un espace compact, topologie sur la frontiere de Choquet.* Rev. Roma. Math. Pures Appl., 9 (1972), p. 1307-1316.

[10] No. Boboc, Gh. Bucur. *Convi convexe de functi continue fe spatii compacte.* Ed. Acad. R.S.R., Bucaresti, 1976.

[11] G. Choquet. *Existences des representations integrales au moyeu des points extrenaux daus les cones convexes.* Seminaire Bourbaki (Dec. 1956), p. 139.

[12] G. Choquet, P.A. Meyer. *Existence et unicite des representations integrales daus les convexes compacts quelconques.* Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 13 (1963), p.

139-154.

[13] J. Dixmier. *Les C^*-algebras et leus representations.* Gauthier-Villaus, Paris, 2ieme ed., 1969.

[14] E.G. Effros. *Structure in simplexes.* Acta Math., 117 (1967), p. 103-121.

[15] B.W. Guedenko, A.N. Kolmogorov. *Greufverteilung von Siemmeu unabhaugiger Znfallsgrossen.* Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1960.

[16] P.L. Hennequin, A. Tortrat. *Theorie des Probabilites et quelques Applications.* Masson Cie, Paris, 1965.

[17] P.A. Meyer. *Probability and Potentials.* Blaisdell Publishing Company, Waltham, Toronto, London, 1966.

[18] J. Neveu. *Bases Mathematiques de Calcul des Probabilites.* Masson Cie, Paris, 1964.

[19] R.R. Phelps. *Lectures on Choquet's Theorem.* Van Nostrand, Princeton, 1966.

[20] C. Ryll-Nardfewski. *On quasicompact measures.* Fundamenta Mathematica, t. XL, 1953, p. 125-130.

[21] J.L. Taylor. *The Tomita decomposition of rings of operators.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., v. 113, no. 1 (1967), p. 30-39.

[22] S. Teleman. *An introduction to Choquet Theory with Applications to Reduction Theory.* INCREST Preprint Series in Mathematics, No. 71,. 1980, p. 1-294.

[23] S. Teleman. *On the regularity of the boundary measures.* INCREST Preprint Series in Mathematics, No. 30, 19871, p. 1-22. Appeared in *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, No. 1014, Springer Verlag, P. 296-315.

[24] S. Teleman. *Measure-theoretic Properties of the Choquet and the Maximal Topologies.* INCREST Preprint Series in Mathematics, No. 33, 1982, p. 1-41.

[25] S. Teleman. *Measure-theoretic Properties of the Maximal Orthogonal Topology.* INCREST Preprint Series in Mathematics, NO. 2, 1984, p. 1-35.

[26] S. Teleman. *Measure-theoretic Properties of the Central Topology on the Set of the Factorial States of a C^*-algebra.* Central Reducation. INCREST Preprint Series in Mathematics, No. 80, 1985, p. 1-79. Appeared in *Opeartor Theory: Proceedings of the 1988 GPOTS-Wabash Conference*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, No. 225, 1990, p. 107-183.

[27] G. Winkler. *Choquet Order and Simplices.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 1145, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1985, p. 1-143.